Class 260.3K Book M316
General Theological Seminary Library
Ninth Ave. and 20th St., New York.
Besides the main topic this book also treats of

Subject No.	*On page*	*Subject No.*	*On page*

THE

UNITY OF THE CHURCH.

BY

HENRY EDWARD MANNING, M.A.,

ARCHDEACON OF CHICHESTER.

GEN. THEOL. SEMINARY
LIBRARY
NEW YORK



LONDON:
JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET.

1842.

260.3 K
M 3 1 6
1132

LONDON:
Printed by WILLIAM CLOWES AND SONS,
Stamford Street.

TO THE

RIGHT HONOURABLE

WILLIAM EWART GLADSTONE,

&c. &c. &c.

THIS WORK

IS AFFECTIONATELY INSCRIBED.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

General Introduction 1

PART I.

THE HISTORY AND EXPOSITION OF THE DOCTRINE OF CATHOLIC UNITY.

CHAPTER I.

The Antiquity of the Article "I believe in the Holy Church" 10

CHAPTER II.

The Interpretation of the Article "The Holy Church," as taught by uninspired Writers 29

CHAPTER III.

The Unity of the Church as taught in Holy Scripture . . 68

CHAPTER IV.

The Form and Matter of Unity 91

CONCLUSION TO THE FIRST PART 163

PART II.

THE MORAL DESIGN OF CATHOLIC UNITY.

CHAPTER I.

The Moral Design of the Church as shown by Holy Scripture 169

CHAPTER II.

PAGE

The Unity of the Church a Means to restore the true Knowledge of God 186

CHAPTER III.

The Unity of the Church a Means to restore Man to the Image of God 229

CHAPTER IV.

The Unity of the Church a Probation of the Faith and Will of Man 255

Conclusion to the Second Part 278

PART III.

The Doctrine of Catholic Unity applied to the Actual State of Christendom.

CHAPTER I.

The Unity of the Church the only revealed Way of Salvation 287

CHAPTER II.

The Loss of Objective Unity 308

CHAPTER III.

The Loss of Subjective Unity 354

General Conclusion 367

PART I.

THE HISTORY AND EXPOSITION OF THE DOCTRINE OF CATHOLIC UNITY.

THE

UNITY OF THE CHURCH.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION.

St. Augustin, in his book concerning the instruction of persons ignorant of the Christian doctrine, after giving many rules for the guidance of the teacher, adds, "but if the catechumen be slow of understanding, and have neither hearing nor heart for the sweetness of truth, he must be borne with tenderly, and, after a short and cursory statement of other points, those things which are chiefly necessary are to be inculcated with much of awe, such as the Unity of the Catholic Church, the nature of temptation, and of the Christian life by reason of the judgment to come."[1] It will sound strange to modern ears to hear the Unity of the Church thus numbered among the first principles of the

[1] S. Aug. de Catechiz. Rudibus. c. xiii.

doctrine of Christ; and by this we may measure how remote are our habits of thought from the tone of Catholic belief. It is to be noted, moreover, that St. Augustin does not treat the doctrine of unity as a first principle only, but as an elementary or axiomatic truth among the first principles of faith. It is to be taught to all catechumens, even to the least intelligent of them. It is, in fact, an object of faith, and a rule of life, without which no man can become a Catholic Christian. Whatsoever any man may safely either not know at all, or know but in part, this at least he must know thoroughly, and believe without a doubt.

The reasons of this necessity are many and obvious; and it will not be amiss to touch on one or two, that we may form some juster estimate of the great importance of the subject on which we are about to enter.

1. First, then, the doctrine of the Unity of the Church is most necessary to be known and believed, as an object of faith, by all Christians, because it is in the One Church alone that there is a revealed way of salvation in the Name of Christ. It is not requisite, in this place, to do more than affirm this mysterious doctrine. Its meaning, limits, and application we shall consider hereafter. It is enough only to refer to it; for all Christians agree in believing that there is such a mystery in the Gospel: they differ only in expounding the nature and fixing the limits of the one Church in which

alone salvation is revealed to man. Whatsoever, then, be the doctrine of salvation in the Church only, it is plainly so related to the doctrine of the Unity or Oneness of the Church itself, as to render a right understanding of the nature of the Church, *i. e.* what, and where it is, highly necessary to all men who are seeking salvation through Jesus Christ. For if they know not what nor where the Church is, how shall they partake of the salvation which is enshrined in it? And if they know not the nature and limits of the Church, how, even after finding it, shall they be assured that they still abide in the way of life? And this brings us to another reason.

2. Secondly, the Unity of the Church is most necessary to be known and acted on as a rule of life by all Christians, because it is a principle of moral obligation. In the first place, it is the correlative of schism, and a safeguard against it. By a right knowledge of unity Catholic Christians know also the nature and forms of schism. It is evident that without this knowledge they may, and we daily see that they do, countenance, partake in, and even themselves originate, acts which are materially schismatical,—such, for instance, as aiding in the propagation of sectarian bodies, being present at acts of worship, or teaching, without the pale of the Church, and the like. It matters not, in this view of the case, what be the true doctrine of unity and of schism: because that there are such realities in

the Christian scheme, and that unity is a duty and schism a sin, all Christians agree in believing. It is as necessary, therefore, to know their true nature and definition, as it is to know the limits of truth and falsehood, and the boundary-lines of good and evil. It is, in fact, a matter of revealed obligation, and a particular form of Christian ethics.

3. Again, a right knowledge of the nature of Unity is necessary, not only as a safeguard against schism, but as a guide in the whole complicated texture of a Christian man's life. It enters into every function and act of the Church around him: it is in her teaching, her worship, her sacraments, her ceremonies, her discipline, her penitential order, her censures, her absolutions: it runs through his private life, in all acts of domestic religion, in all the conduct, and temper, and converse of a Catholic Christian: it besets him behind and before, and lays its hand upon him in all his relations to his brethren, to his pastor, to his Lord: it is a governing rule of his moral choice, teaching him what to do and what to forbear, what to testify and what to hold in silence: it is the outward index, and the unerring means of "the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace," and thereby of his perfection in the likeness of Christ.

Now these are some among many reasons which might be brought to shew the necessity of delivering to all catechumens the doctrine of Catholic Unity. There are also two remarks I would make on the

present condition of the Church of Christ, which will the more strongly impress on us the duty of faithfully instructing our people in this great rule of life.

And first it must be remembered that this doctrine, which, in the time of St. Augustin, was definite and undoubted, is now perplexed and gainsaid. In his day the nature of unity was admitted: the only dispute, as with the Donatists, turned on the question, which of two contending bodies was indeed the one true Church. How many and various soever were the sects by which the Church was then beset, she had yet within a clear and sustained consciousness of her own unity, of which consciousness she carefully made all her members to partake. They carried with them, as it were, a talisman which kept them from wandering into the conventicles of schism. Now we, in these latter times, are beset by no fewer schisms than they were of old. The state of the Western Church for the last three hundred years, our familiar intercourse with Christians in a state of open schism, the visible moral excellence of many born and reared in separation, the deadening effect of political combination, the wayward partizanship of men in the communion of the Church, and then again, together with all these, a habit of indifference, laxity, and a spurious charity, which, like a hidden stream, undermines the steadfastness of principle,—all these have so lowered the standard of teaching and thought

among us, that we fail to impress upon our catechumens any definite or intelligible idea of the Unity of the Church, *i. e.* what it is, wherein it consists, and how it makes us responsible for our moral acts. Certain it is, that we have come to look upon the doctrine of Unity as a part of the *theologia armata*,—as a weapon of offence. We shrink from teaching it, lest we should seem to condemn those who are visibly in schism; and thus, for the sins of Christendom, it has come to pass that what was ordained unto life is found to be unto death; and men, by striving to and fro to establish their conflicting theories, are divided in the very article of unity. Or, on the other hand, the false charity of being silent the more embroils the fray; so that, if we, to whom the only word that can still the storm has been imparted, shall refuse to speak it, what do we do?—what reckoning shall we give to Him that bequeathed his peace unto us? No sober man can doubt that one chief cause of the continuance of schism, and therefore of perplexity and error, among our people, is our slackness in faithfully expounding to them the articles of their baptismal creed. If the pastors of the flock should slur over the article of the Incarnation of our Lord as they have slurred over that of the Unity of the Church, her people would have been long since heretical. The low tone of teaching now prevalent on this doctrine is one reason to enforce the duty of bestowing much anxious thought and care in restoring some true

and effectual mode of inculcating it upon our catechumens.

The other remark I would venture to make is on the defective state of our catechetical formularies in the point of this doctrine. In our Prayer-book it is everywhere assumed that the people are duly taught in the nature of the one Church: as for instance, in the Prayer for all sorts and conditions of men, in the collects for the Feasts of St. Simon and St. Jude, and of All Saints; in the service for the Visitation of the Sick, where we pray that God may "preserve and continue this sick member in the unity of the Church;" and also in the Litany, where the people are taught to pray for deliverance from the sin of schism. It is therefore evident that a knowledge of the nature of unity is pre-supposed; and without doubt, when these services were published in the vulgar tongue, the context of the Church's oral teaching filled up all that was needful for the right understanding of them. But, with submission to those to whose hands the disposal of such things is intrusted, I would venture to adopt, as my own, the wish of a layman whose name will be its own sanction. "If ever a convocation should think fit to revise the catechism of the Church, to whose authority and judgment an affair of that nature ought to be entirely submitted, it is possible they may find it necessary to add some questions concerning those who have the power of administering sacraments, and how they receive such an

authority, and what duties are owing by God's word to our spiritual guides: because such sort of instructions, early instilled into tender minds, might in the next generation retrieve that respect to the sacred order which we so scandalously want in this; and they would have this further advantage, that they would be a means of keeping men steadfast to the communion of the Church, and of preserving them from falling into schisms, even in a state of persecution; from the possibility of which no human establishment can secure the Church of God, while she is militant here on earth. And till this can be effected, it is to be wished the reverend clergy would more frequently instruct the people in such duties. The want of which necessary knowledge makes the principles of Church communion so little understood, that men are 'tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the slight of men, and cunning craftiness whereby they lie in wait to deceive.' I am very sensible great modesty hath prevailed upon them to divert their thoughts from this subject, lest it should be interpreted a preaching up themselves; but the same fears may as well prevent parents from instructing their children, and masters their servants, in those duties that relate to themselves." [1]

How far the following work may supply a definite view of this great Christian doctrine it is not for me to do more than hope. It is my heart's

[1] Nelson's Fasts and Festivals. Preface, p. xiii.

desire to lend a hand, so far as I may, to the great and charitable work of clearing off the entanglements by which the path of unity and of eternal life has been well nigh hidden from the eyes of men of good will.

The course I have taken is as follows:—I have treated the subject of unity in three aspects: first, its positive nature, or *what* it is by the ordinance of God; next, so far as Holy Scripture will carry us, the end and design, or *why* God has so ordained the scheme of our redemption; and lastly, the existing anomalies of the Christian world, or how we may reconcile the exact doctrine of unity with the irregularities which are visible around us. The first part, therefore, is dogmatic or historical, tracing out the doctrine of Unity in the Catholic Creeds, and in the inspired and uninspired documents of the Church. The second part is moral, but confined to the testimony of Holy Scripture alone. The third and last is practical or casuistical, and is discussed upon the principles and by the lights gathered from the two previous parts, and from the decisions of the Catholic Church.

CHAPTER I.

ON THE ANTIQUITY OF THE ARTICLE, "I BELIEVE IN THE HOLY CHURCH."

BEFORE we proceed to examine the intention of this article of the Catholic creeds, it will be right to make some inquiry into its antiquity.

That it has been received as a part of the Christian Faith in all churches of the East and West, through the whole tract of time since the Council of Constantinople, is admitted on all hands.

But a question may yet be raised as to its origin. It may be still asked whether or no this article were included in the Creed in the times of the Apostles; whether or not they required of every convert a profession of belief in the one Holy Church?

In answering this question, we will first collect the facts of the case, and then make some remarks upon them, so as to lay the ground for a definite conclusion.

In the first place, the whole Catholic Church, having united in receiving the creed of the Council

of Constantinople, has united in holding as an article of faith the doctrine of "one Catholic and Apostolic Church," since the year A.D. 381; that is, for about fifteen hundred years.

Our inquiry, therefore, is limited to the three centuries from the Council of Constantinople to the first opening of the Apostolic mission.

Now, we must observe that the Constantinopolitan or Nicene Creed has a character peculiar to itself, being the first promulgation of the Christian faith by conciliary authority. It may be called, therefore, a conciliary or synodal creed (*symbolum synodale*), to distinguish it from the baptismal creeds of the several Churches of which it was a public representative. The creed of the Nicene Council, although readily embraced by all branches of the Catholic Church, has never to this day displaced the baptismal creed of the Western Church, and was partially and by slow degrees substituted for the other traditional forms in the Eastern. Some Churches incorporated a portion of it in their own particular creed; but the catechetical lectures of St. Cyril, which were delivered after the closing of the Nicene Council, are an exposition of the baptismal creed, which was retained in the Church of Jerusalem until the middle of the fourth century. Even so late as the middle of the fifth, the Church of Antioch still retained its own baptismal profession.[1]

[1] Observ. in Symb. Hierosol., p. 80. 3. Opp. S. Cyril. Hier. Ed. Touttée.

We must, therefore, refer to the baptismal creeds of the several Churches.

And, first, of the Eastern Church.

Epiphanius has preserved two creeds, which he enjoins pastors of the Church to teach to such as are approaching the baptismal font (*μελλόντας τῷ ἁγίῳ λουτρῷ προσιέναί*).[1] In what particular Churches they were used is not certainly known, except that they were the Churches of Cyprus, and especially of Salamis, of which Epiphanius was Bishop.[2]

In the first (of which he says "This is the faith which was delivered by the holy Apostles, and in the Church, the holy city, by all the holy Bishops, with one accord, to the number of more than three hundred and ten")[3] the article stands thus: "We believe . . . in one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church;" and in the other, "We believe in One Catholic and Apostolic Church."

Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria, in his letter to Alexander of Constantinople (about A.D. 317), exposing the impiety of the Arians, recites the form of doctrine taught in his own Church (*ταῦτα διδάσκομεν ταῦτα κηρύττομεν, ταῦτα τῆς ἐκκλησιᾶς τὰ ἀποστολικὰ δόγματα, κ. τ. λ.*): "We confess," he

[1] Epiph. Ancoratus. ss. cxix. cxx. cxxi. Walchius, Bibliotheca Symbolica, 50, 51.

[2] Walchius, ibid. 52, 53.

[3] Epiph.Ancor. cxx.: *εἰς μίαν ἁγίαν καθολικὴν καὶ Ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν.*

says, "one and one only Catholic Church, that which is Apostolic." [1]

The next creed we may adduce will have more weight for our present purpose, for the very reason which shakes its authority in other respects, being a confession of faith, presented, as it is believed, by Arius and Euzoius, when they made a sort of feigned recantation. In the article before us it runs as follows:—"We believe . . . in one Catholic Church of God, which is from one end of the world to the other." They go on to say, "This faith we received from the holy Gospels, forasmuch as the Lord said to his disciples, Go ye, and teach all nations, baptizing them, &c." [2] This was doubtless the creed of the Alexandrian Church, to which they desired reconciliation. [3]

I have already spoken of the creed of the Church of Jerusalem, expounded by St. Cyril to the candidates for baptism. He calls it "the holy Apostolic faith," and everywhere treats it as the doctrine which the Church had always held and taught to the baptized. The present article stands thus: "We believe . . . in one holy Catholic Church." [4]

The creeds of the Churches of Antioch and Cæsarea are preserved by several fathers and doc-

[1] μίαν καὶ μόνην καθολικὴν τὴν Ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν. Theodoret, lib. 1. civ. pp. 19, 20, ed. Reading. Walch. p. 49.

[2] Socrat. Hist. lib. 1. c. 26. Walch. p. 49. Bingham, Orig. Eccl. b. x. c. v. s. 10.

[3] διὸ παρακαλοῦμεν . . . ἑνούσθαι ἡμᾶς . . τῇ μητρὶ ἡμῶν. Socrat. Hist. ibid.

[4] Catech. xviii. 32.: εἰς μίαν ἁγίαν καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν.

tors of the Church, but only by way of testimony against the Arian heresy. In their citations, therefore, no more is quoted than was enough to condemn the errors against which they testified. For this reason the third and last member of the creed is almost wholly omitted.[1]

There still remain to be cited two very remarkable documents of the Eastern Church.

In the exposition of the Apostles' Creed, by Ruffinus, is to be seen a comparison of three several forms, the Roman, the Aquileian, and a third which he refers to as the creed of the Eastern Church. This Eastern creed is extant only in Latin,—is almost identical with the Aquileian and Roman,—was plainly very much more ancient than the Nicene Council,—and may be taken as the representative to the Western or Latin Churches of the faith of the Greek Churches of the East. We shall hereafter see reason to conclude that the fact of its existing only in Latin is no objection to its genuineness. In this creed the article stands in these words: "I believe . . . the Holy Church."[2]

The other and the last which I shall adduce from the Eastern Church is the baptismal creed, recited in the book of the Apostolical Constitutions.

It must be observed that this compilation was made probably in the third or fourth century, but

[1] See Walch. pp. 40, 46. Bingham, b. x. cv. s. 9, 11, and xiv., where he shows the reason of this omission.

[2] Ruffin. Expos. in Symb. Ap. ad calc. S. Cypriani Opp. "Credo . . . Sanctam Ecclesiam."

that the date is unimportant, inasmuch as it is not denied that the book exhibits to us the outline and condition of the Church from its earliest times. The compiler, after giving directions how catechumens ought to be instructed, describes the renunciation of Satan made in baptism, and the confession of Christ which followed. The candidate was directed to say, "I believe and am baptized into one unbegotten, the only true God, &c. . . . I am baptized into the Holy Ghost, that is the Comforter, which wrought in all the saints from the beginning, and afterwards was sent also to the apostles by the Father, according to the promise of the Saviour our Lord Jesus Christ, and after the apostles to all who in the Holy Catholic Church believe also," &c.[1]

We may now, in like manner, collect the suffrages of the Western Church.

The first we will cite is the creed of the Spanish Church, preserved by Etherius and Beatus in a book written against Elipandus. Although this work was compiled towards the end of the eighth century, the creed recited by them is given as the baptismal creed of the Church, and believed by them to be transmitted from the apostles.[2] The article stands thus:—"I believe . . . the Holy Catholic Church."

In the ancient missal of the Gallican Church, as

[1] Apost. Const. lib. vii. c. 41.

[2] Bibliotheca Vet. Patr. Gallandii, tom. xiii. 295. "Sanctam Ecclesiam Catholicam."

given by Martene,[1] is the creed which was delivered to candidates for baptism. The article runs as usual—"I believe . . . one Holy Catholic Church."

Another creed used in the Gallican Church, probably at Poictiers, is preserved in an exposition by Venantius Fortunatus,[2] who was Bishop of that see in the sixth century. It is evidently a very ancient form, the articles of the Burial of Christ, the "Communion of Saints," and "Life everlasting," being omitted, which is not the case in the later creeds. The article before us stands, "I believe . . . the Holy Church," which is its simplest and earliest form.

St. Augustin has delivered to us the creed of the African Church, in his book De Fide et Symbolo,[3] where the article stands, "I believe . . . the Holy Catholic Church."

Maximus, Bishop of Tours (A.D. 422), has preserved the baptismal creed of that Church.[4] Its great antiquity is evident from the simplicity of the wording. The article runs, as in the oldest forms, "I believe . . . the Holy Church."

In the creed of the Church of Ravenna, given by Petrus Chrysologus, who was Bishop of that see,[5] the article is found as follows: "I believe . . . the Holy Catholic Church."

[1] De Antiq. Ecclesiæ Ritibus. tom. i. 33.

[2] Venantii Opp. P. i. lib. xi. ed. Rom. p. 377.

[3] S. Aug. tom. vi. 161.

[4] Maximi Taurin. Opp. Hom. i. De diversis ad calc. Opp. S. Leonis. ed. Venet. 1748. ed. Rom. p. 272.

[5] Petri Chrysol. Hom. lvii. Opp. ed. Venet. 1742.

We now come to the creed of the Church of Aquileia. There are extant three several forms: two preserved by a writer who lived about the middle of the ninth century,[1] and one by Ruffinus, in the fourth,[2] which he represents as the immemorial tradition of the Church. The three forms differ only in one word; two having, "I believe . . . the holy Church," and one "I believe . . . the Holy Catholic Church."

The last witness we have to adduce is that of the Roman Church. There are extant no fewer than seven forms,[3] so authenticated by their relation to the Roman Church as to represent to us the baptismal profession there in use.

Three of them are found in the Greek language. Strange as this fact may seem at first sight, it is capable of an easy and full explanation.

In the first place, it was the custom in the Roman and many other Latin Churches to recite the Creed both in Latin and in Greek, at the season of conferring baptism. This custom was preserved so long, that when in the darker times of the Western Church the clergy could not so much as read the Greek character, the Greek version of the Creed was written in their ritual with the Italic; and, as Archbishop Ussher discovered, also in the Anglo-Saxon character.[4] This last transcript is to be seen

[1] Walch. Bib. Symb., pp. 54, 56.
[2] Ruffin. Expos. in Symb.; also Walch. ibid. p. 37.
[3] Walch. ibid. pp. 56, 61.
[4] Usserii de Romanæ Eccl. Symbolis Diatriba, p. 8. The in-

at the end of King Athelstan's Psalter, written about the year A.D. 703.[1]

In the next place, one of the Greek versions is a translation of what we commonly call the Apostles' Creed.[2] This was also found by Archbishop Ussher. It is most likely that both these were received by the Anglo-Saxon from the Roman Church.

A third form is called the Creed of Marcellus of Ancyra, and was delivered by him to Julius, Bishop of Rome, to attest his orthodoxy, when he had been driven by the Arians or Eusebians from his see.[3] This version is in more exact agreement with the Roman than with any Eastern Creed, being doubtless the Baptismal Creed of that Church, adopted by Marcellus as a guarantee of his orthodoxy.

In these forms the article stands as follows:— In two of them, "I believe . . . the Holy Church." In the third, "I believe . . . in the Holy Catholic Church."

Of the Latin forms, one is the Creed commonly called the Creed of the Apostles, which has, "I believe . . . the Holy Catholic Church." A second is found in the Roman Ordinal, in which the article stands in the same words. A third is the Creed given by Archbishop Ussher as the ordinary form,

terrogation before the Creed was also used in Greek in the church of Poictiers. See Martene de Antiq. Eccl. Ritibus, tom. i. p. 38. Walch. ibid. p. 57.

[1] Bingham, Orig. Eccl. B. x. c. v. s. 10, and Ussher ut supra.

[2] Walch. Bib. Symb., p. 58.

[3] Bibliotheca Vet. Patr. Galland. tom. v. 17. The view in the text is taken by Archbishop Ussher, and by Walchius, Bib. Symb. pp. 56, 57.

which has, "I believe . . . the Holy Church." The fourth and last is a response made by the candidate for baptism, in the Sacramentary of Gelasius, which has, "I believe . . . the Holy Church."

Having now gathered the facts on which this question must ultimately rest, I proceed to make a few observations, after which we may venture to draw our conclusion.

And first it is evident that a belief in the Unity of the Church forms an article in every Baptismal Creed of every Church, both in the East and in the West.

I am not aware of any Baptismal Creed extant in which this article is not to be read.

And here I may make two remarks to guard this assertion from objections.

First, there are to be found condensed and oblique citations of the ancient Creeds, adduced by the Fathers for the special and direct purpose of refuting some emergent and partial heresy. In such cases, a part only of the Creed is quoted, as the two first members were wont to be adduced in the Arian controversy. The omission of the rest, which is sometimes marked in words (as by "et reliqua"), though sometimes not marked at all, is no disproof of the assertion I have made. This will apply to the Creeds of the Churches of Cæsarea and Antioch, and to some others.

Secondly, there are certain interlocutory forms of confessing the Holy Trinity, which were repeated by candidates for baptism, from which almost all

other articles were omitted, as the form in the Liturgy of St. James, which runs as follows:—"I believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God." But this would prove too much, as it omits also the article of "the Holy Ghost."[1] Another is to be seen in the Catechetics of St. Cyril:—"I believe in the Father, and in the Son, and in the Holy Ghost, and in one baptism of repentance."[2] But it is evident that this is not the confession of faith, but an act of self-dedication to the Holy Trinity, made by the catechumen turning to the East before he turned to the West for the abrenunciation of Satan. This was the practice of several Churches: as, for instance, at Jerusalem, at Rome, at Milan, and in the Churches of Spain, Gaul, and Cappadocia.[3] Nevertheless, in these Churches the entire Creed also was recited by candidates for baptism. The self-dedication to the Holy Trinity was a distinct part of the baptismal office. There is also, in the Sermo de Symbolo ad Catechumenos,[4] falsely ascribed to St. Augustin, a form which omits this article; but it omits also several other parts, as the word "only," and "Lord" in the confession of Jesus Christ, also the session at the right hand of God.[5] In other respects also it so far varies from the wording of the African Creed

[1] Walch. Bib. Symb., p. 42. Probably only the first words are given as a rubrical order.

[2] S. Cyril. Catech. xix. 9, ed. Touttée.

[3] S. Cyril. ed. Touttée. Prolog. in Catech. Myst. s. viii. p. 305.

[4] S. Aug. tom. vi. 556. ed. Ben. [5] Ibid. 561, 564.

as to show that it is not a baptismal form, and this is all I am concerned to prove.

Lastly, I may notice that the rule of faith appealed to by St. Irenæus[1] and Tertullian[2] is plainly, and even at first sight, a large and loose recital of the Evangelical traditions, nearly enough allied to the baptismal profession to remind the reader throughout of the exacter forms, but at the same time so visibly informal and general as to disclaim for itself all pretension to the exactness of a baptismal Creed. They sufficiently indicate the existence, and represent the substance of such a form, while they manifestly disclaim the character and authority of a recognised Creed.

Such being the three classes of documents from which apparent objections may be alleged, I venture to repeat that the omission of this article in such documents is no disproof of the assertion that the article of the Unity of the Church forms a part of every Baptismal Creed in existence.

I say the article of the Unity of the Church, for such is the substance in which all Creeds, how variously soever they may be worded, exactly agree.

The variety of expression in the forms above cited may be reduced to the following classes.

They all assert the article in some one of these three forms:—

[1] Adv. Hær. lib. i. 10. ed. Ben.

[2] De Virg. Veland. c. 1. Contra Prax. c. 2. De Præscrip. c. 13. ed. Rigalt.

1. "One Catholic and Apostolic Church," as the Constantinopolitan or Nicene; the Creed recited by Epiphanius, and the Alexandrian, which adds (*μόνην*), "one only."

2. "The Holy Catholic Church," as the Apostles' Creed, the Spanish, the Gallican, the forms in the Roman Ordinal and the Apostolical Constitution, and one of the Aquileian Creeds.

3. "The Holy Church," as the Roman, two of the Aquileian Creeds, the Ancient Eastern, the Creed of Marcellus, the Creeds of Ravenna, Turin, the African, one of the Gallican, and the form in the Sacramentary of Gelasius.

There are one or two formularies which, from some slight variety in the combination of the terms, will not fall into these classes, and may therefore stand alone, not being of sufficient importance to form a separate class.

Of the three classes above given, the first two, which are more explicit, are also later. The third and last class represents the article as it is found in the earliest Creeds, and with this therefore we have now to do.

At present I need only conclude that the Unity of the Church is contained as an article of faith in every Baptismal Creed on record.

The next observation I would make, is, that there is positive evidence that a profession of faith in the Unity of the Church formed part of the Baptismal Creed as early as the second century.

The writers who have handed down these formularies always and everywhere speak of them as a tradition of immemorial antiquity. The Bishops and Catechists of the fourth century—*i. e.* between the years A.D. 300 and A.D. 400—deliver these Creeds to the catechumens as the same form of words on the profession of which they and their forefathers were baptized. They assume everywhere that it is an Apostolical tradition.

But we have more direct evidence than this general presumption.

St. Cyprian, writing to Magnus concerning the Novatian schism (A.D. 255), says, "But if any one should object, and say that Novatian holds the same rule as the Catholic Church, baptizes in the same Creed that we do, acknowledges the same God the Father, the same Christ the Son, the same Holy Ghost; and for that reason, because he appears not to differ from us in the interrogatories at baptism, may therefore exercise the power of baptizing; let such an objector know, first, that we have not one and the same rule in the Creed with the schismatics, nor the same interrogatories; for when they say, 'Dost thou believe the remission of sins, and life everlasting through the Holy Church?' they lie in their interrogatory, forasmuch as they do not hold the Church. Then by the confession which they make with their own mouth, that the remission of sins cannot be given except through the Holy Church, which they do not hold to, they them-

selves show that sins cannot be forgiven among them." [1]

Hence it is clear beyond a controversy that the article stood in the Baptismal Creed, both of the Catholic Church and of the Novatian schism.

But we have in the next epistle a direct proof. In the following letter St. Cyprian writes:—"The very interrogatory which is made in baptism is a witness of the truth: for when we say, 'Dost thou believe in life everlasting, and the remission of sins through the Holy Church?' we understand that remission of sins is given only in the Church." [2]

The next evidence, and of a still earlier date, is a passage of Tertullian in his treatise on Baptism. Speaking of the Holy Trinity, he says, "If by three witnesses every word shall stand, how much more does the number of the Divine names suffice also to confirm our hope, seeing that we have by the benediction the same as witnesses of (our) faith, who are also the sureties of our salvation? But forasmuch as the attestation of (our) faith, and the promise of salvation are pledged under three (*i. e.* witnesses), the mention of the Church is necessarily added, since where three are—that is, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost—there is the Church, which is the body of the three. After that, when we have come out of the font, we are anointed with

[1] Ad Magnum, Ep. 69. ed. Fell. p. 296. Walch. Bibl. Symb. p. 12.
[2] Ep. 70. ed. Fell. p. 301. Walch. p. 13.

the blessed oil." [1] The last sentence puts it beyond all controversy that Tertullian is narrating the substance of the baptismal confession made by the candidate in the font.

But to put the fact even further out of doubt, we may refer to the full and deliberate argument raised by St. Augustin on the relation in which this article of the Creed stands to the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. After expounding the Creed at large, he says:—"In like manner we ought to believe in the Holy Ghost, that the Trinity, which is God, may have its fulness. Then the Holy Church is mentioned." . . . . "The right order of the confession required that to the Trinity should be subjoined the Church, as the dwelling to the inhabitant, and as His temple to the Lord, and the city to its builder." [2]

From what has been said we may safely conclude that the article of the Unity of the Church was a part of the Baptismal Creed in Tertullian's time, that is, at the end of the second century.

The learned annotator on Bishop Bull's 'Judicium Ecclesiæ Catholicæ,' after admitting the preceding conclusion, imagines that this article was inserted at the end of the first or the beginning of the second century, when heretics and schismatics began to form separate congre-

[1] Tertull. de Bapt. s. 6. ed. Rigalt, p. 226. Pearson on the Creed, p. 334.

[2] S. Aug. Enchirid. de Fide, &c., c. lvi. tom. vi. 217.

gations. But this necessity existed from the time of St. Paul's preaching at Corinth, and throughout the whole course of the Apostolic times.[1] The next observation I would, therefore, make is, that no time can be assigned, nor any person alleged, when and by whom this article was first introduced into the Creed. If it was not in the Baptismal Creed used by the Apostles, it must have been introduced at some time between the death of St. John, about A.D. 100, and the birth of Tertullian, about A.D. 150.[2] If so, the name of the person who introduced it, or of the Church where it was first received, or the time of the insertion, or the cause of its adoption, would surely have been at least hinted in the history of the Church. But there is not so much as the slightest trace of such an event: which strange silence on so great a matter in a circle and series of so many Churches, both Greek and Latin, in the East and in the West, which must have adopted it gradually and in succession, puts this conjecture past all belief.

The acknowledged additions made to the Creed were noted, and the reasons avowed, as in the insertion of the words "of one substance" against the Arians; and indeed in this particular article, in the addition of the word "Catholic," which was first

[1] Annotata J. E. Grabe in Judic. Eccl. Cathol. ad cap. vi. s. 11.

[2] Bishop of Lincoln's History of the Second and Third Centuries, p. 12.

inserted by the Greek Churches for the purpose, as St. Cyril[1] tells us, of distinguishing the true Church from all schismatical congregations. The addition of the epithet "Catholic" to the words "Holy Church" is thus carefully recorded, but the origin of the article to which the addition was made must be sought in the same teaching from whence the Baptismal Confession was itself derived. Still, in thus referring to the institution of the Apostles it is hardly necessary that we should refute in express terms the story which narrates that the Apostles' Creed was compiled by a synod of the Apostles, each making his several contribution of one of the articles as they now stand: the article, which is the subject of our present inquiry, being the portion assigned to St. Matthew. This fanciful account had its rise in the fifth century; is a Latin tradition, being unknown to the Eastern Churches;[2] and is self-convicted of untruth, as the Creed commonly called the Apostles' Creed is well known to be an augmented form of the earlier and simpler confession.[3]

Having seen in the foregoing evidence that all Churches consented in professing at baptism a belief in the Holy Church—that there is direct evidence

[1] S. Cyril. Catech. xviii. s. 26.

[2] When the Latins at the Council of Florence affirmed that their creed was composed by the Apostles, the Greeks answered ἡμεῖς οὔτε ἔχομεν οὔτε εἴδομεν σύμβολον τῶν Ἀποστόλων. "We neither possess nor have seen any creed of the Apostles." See Suicer. Thesaur. Eccl. in voc. σύμβολον.

[3] Dupin. History of Eccl. Writers, vol. i. p. 378, folio, 1723.

of the existence of this article in the baptismal forms of the second century—that no baptismal form can be adduced from which it is omitted, and no time assigned for such an insertion, nor any intimation that such an addition to the Creed was made between the beginning and the end of the first century (for to this short tract of time the question is finally narrowed)—I conclude that a belief in the Unity of the Church, however expressed in words, was required of every candidate for Christian baptism from the beginning of the Gospel. For "whatsoever the Universal Church maintains, the same being instituted by no council, but always retained, is rightly believed to be handed down from no other authority than that of the Apostles." [1]

[1] S. Aug. de Bapt. contra Donatistas, lib. iv. c. xxiv. tom. ix. 140.

CHAPTER II.

THE INTERPRETATION OF THE ARTICLE "THE HOLY CHURCH," AS TAUGHT BY UNINSPIRED WRITERS.

In the foregoing chapter we have considered what may be called the history of the article before us. No attempt has been made to attach to it any definite interpretation. So far as we have hitherto proceeded, every class of Christians, except those who reject the Catholic Creeds, may claim the authority of the Baptismal Confession, as a witness to confirm each several way of explaining the Unity of the Church. For in teaching that there is only one Church of Christ all Christians agree, the only controversy being wherein that one Church consists.

I wish it to be clearly understood that in this chapter we shall follow exactly the same course as in the foregoing.

Our inquiry will be strictly historical. I shall abstain with all carefulness from seeming to assert

what is the true doctrine of the Unity of the Church, and shall confine myself to inquiring in what sense this article was expounded in the earliest times. Whether such expositions be right or wrong will be a matter for discussion hereafter. For the present it is enough to examine how this article was wont to be interpreted, or, to use the same form of speech as before, to consider the history of the interpretation.

The only point, therefore, for the reader's judgment is, whether or no the mind of the writers, hereafter adduced, be truly represented.

It will be both the simpler and surer course to take first the direct expositions of the article, and next the general teaching of Christian writers on the doctrine of the Unity of the Church.

Of the direct exposition of the Creed, the earliest is that of St. Cyril. It is preserved to us in the form of catechetical lectures to candidates for holy baptism. They were delivered about A.D. 347, before he was raised to the bishopric of Jerusalem. In the creed of that Church, as in most of the Eastern creeds, the word "Catholic" had been already inserted.

"Let us therefore speak," he says, "of what remains, namely, on the article, 'and in One Holy Catholic Church.' . . . . . It is called, then, Catholic, because it is throughout the whole world, from one end of the earth to the other; and because it teaches universally and without fail all doctrines that are necessary for man to know, concerning

both visible and invisible things, both heavenly and earthly; and because it subjects the whole race of man unto godliness, both rulers and ruled, learned and unlearned; and because it universally tends, and heals every form of sin committed in soul and body; and because there is contained in it every kind of virtue which is named in deed and word, and all kinds of spiritual gifts.

"It is called the 'Church' (ἐκκλησία) by a most fitting appellation, because it calls out all men, and gathers them in one, as the Lord speaks in the book of Leviticus—'Call together (ἐκκλησίασον) the whole congregation (συναγωγή) to the door of the tabernacle of witness.' Moreover it is worthy of observation that this word (ἐκκλησίασον) is first used in Scripture in this place when the Lord appointed Aaron to the high priesthood. . . . . From the time that the Jews, on account of their evil plotting against the Saviour, were cast away from grace, the Saviour built a second Church from the Gentiles, that is, the Holy Church of us Christians, concerning which he said to Peter, 'And on this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.' . . . . . After the one Church which was in Judæa had been cut off, thenceforward the Churches of Christ are multiplied throughout all the world. . . . . But forasmuch as the name 'Church' is applied to diverse things . . . . therefore the Creed with guarded care has delivered to thee the article 'in One Holy Ca-

tholic Church,' that thou mayest avoid the hateful assemblies (of heretics) and cleave alway to the holy Catholic Church in which thou wast regenerated. And if at any time thou art in strange cities, ask, not merely, where is the Lord's house?—for the sects and heresies of the impious endeavour to honour their dens with the name of the Lord's house—nor merely, where is the Church? but, where is the Catholic Church? for that is the proper name of her that is holy and the mother of us all. . . . . For when that first Church had been cut off, in the second, that is, the Catholic Church, 'God,' as Paul saith, 'gave, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, then powers, then gifts of healing, helps, governments, divers kinds of tongues, &c. . . . . And whereas the kings of particular nations have limits set to their power, the Holy Catholic Church alone has a power without limit in all the world."[1]

The next exposition is that of Ruffinus, a few years later than St. Cyril.

"The tradition of the faith contains next 'the Holy Church.' . . . . . They, therefore, who have been already taught to believe in one God, in the mystery of the Trinity, ought also believe this, that the Holy Church is one, in which is one faith and one baptism, in which men believe in one God the Father, one Lord Jesus Christ His Son, and one Holy Ghost. That, therefore, is the Holy Church,

[1] S. Cyril. Hieros. Cat. xxiii. 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27.

not having spot or wrinkle. Many others, indeed, have gathered Churches, as Marcion, Valentinus, Hebion, Manichæus, and Arius, and all other heretics. But they are not Churches without spot or wrinkle of false faith. And therefore the prophet said concerning them, 'I hate the congregation of evil-doers, and with the wicked I will not sit.' But concerning the Church which keeps whole the faith of Christ, hear what the Holy Ghost says in the Song of Songs, 'My dove is one, the perfect one of her mother is one.' "[1]

St. Augustin, in his book 'De Fide et Symbolo,' speaks as follows:—

"But forasmuch as we are not only commanded to love God, when it is said 'thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and all thy soul, and all thy mind,' but also our neighbour, 'for,' he saith, 'thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself,' if this faith (of ours) does not hold to the congregation and fellowship of men in which brotherly love worketh, it bears less fruit. We believe, moreover, 'the Holy Church,' that is, 'the Catholic.' For both heretics and schismatics call their congregations Churches. But heretics, by false opinions concerning God, violate the faith itself; and schismatics, by their evil divisions, break off from brotherly love, though they believe the same things that we believe. Wherefore neither heretics belong

[1] Ruffin. Expos. in Symb. Ap. ad calc. opp. S. Cyp. p. 166. ed. Fell.

to the Catholic Church, for that it loves God; nor schismatics, for that it loves our neighbour." [1]

And again, in his discourse De Symbolo, he says, "After the confession of the Trinity follows 'the Holy Church.' Both God and his temple are set forth. 'For,' saith the apostle, 'the temple of God is holy, which (temple) ye are.' The same is the Holy Church, the one Church, the true Church, the Catholic Church, warring against all heresies; for war it may, but warred down it never can be. All heresies went out from her, as worthless branches cut from the vine: but she abideth in her root, in her life, in her love. Her the gates of hell shall not overcome." [2]

Among the works of St. Augustin are three discourses on the Creed, which for a long time were supposed to be his. The Benedictine editors, on the strength of internal evidence, have judged them to be the work of some other hand. They were, however, manifestly written about the fourth century, for they speak of the Arian heresy as the active and foremost enemy of the Church.

On the article we treat of the writer says, "No man can have love nor charity who is not in His Church; forasmuch as no one that is out of it can be with God, who is life eternal. Therefore this mystery (the Creed) concludes with the Church, for that she is the fruitful mother, perfect and chaste,

[1] S. Aug. Liber de Fide et Symbolo, tom. vi. 161. ed. Ben.
[2] Liber de Symbolo, c. vi. tom. vi. 554. ed. Ben.

everywhere spread abroad, bearing spiritual sons unto God, spiritually nourishing her little ones with the milk of her words, teaching boys wisdom, guarding youth from luxury and immodesty by her holy chastity, arming young men against the devil with the strength of virtue, and teaching the aged prudence, and making the elders venerable. Through her, young men and virgins, the elders with the young, every age and sex, praise the name of the Lord. She recalls her sons from their wanderings, weeps mournfully for the dead, and nourishes without lack those that cleave unto her. Her, my beloved, let us all love: to such a mother, so loving, so provident, so prudent, let us all inseparably cling, that together with her and through her we may be meet to be for ever joined to God the Father." [1]

In another of these discourses the writer thus expounds the same words: "The end of this mystery is therefore summed up by the Holy Church: because if any man is found without it, he will be an alien from the number of sons; nor shall he have God for his Father who will not have the Church for his mother: nor will it avail him anything to have believed, and done so many good works, without the end of the chief good. The Church is a spiritual mother; the Church is the bride of Christ, clad in white by His grace, dowried with His precious blood. She possesses all that she received in

[1] Liber de Symbolo, tom. vi. 575.

dowry from her Husband. I will read and recite the marriage deed. Hear, ye heretics, what is written. 'It behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead, and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name among all nations.' 'All nations' signifies all the world. The Church possesses all that she received in dowry from her Husband. The congregation of heresy, whatsoever it be, that sits in a corner, it is an harlot, and not a matron. O thou heresy of Arius, why insultest thou? why dost thou scornfully renounce us? why for a time dost thou usurp so boldly? The wife suffers injurious treatment from thee, the bondwoman: thou loadest her with many contumelies. Though she weep, the Holy Catholic Church, the spouse of Christ, doth not greatly fear thee. For so soon as the Spouse shall look upon her, thou as a bondwoman shalt be cast out with thy children; for the children of the bondwoman shall not be heirs with the children of the free. Let her therefore be acknowledged as the One, Holy, True, and Catholic queen, to whom Christ hath given such a kingdom; for He hath spread her abroad throughout the world, and cleansed her from all spot and wrinkle, and hath made her ready and altogether fair for His own coming." [1]

In another exposition by Nicetas, Bishop of Aquileia, in the fifth century, we find the article thus explained. "After the confession of the blessed

[1] Liber de Symbolo, tom. vi. 582.

Trinity thou makest profession of faith in the Holy Catholic Church. What else is the Church than the congregation of all saints? From the beginning of the world all (the righteous), whether patriarchs, as Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, or prophets, or apostles, or martyrs, or any other who have been, or are, or shall be righteous, are one Church, inasmuch as, being sanctified by one faith and conversation, sealed by one Spirit, they are made one body, of which Christ is head, as it is declared and written. I say more, even angels, and virtues, and the higher powers, are confederated in this one Church, as the Apostle teaches us that 'in Christ are all things reconciled, not only things in earth, but things in heaven.' Believe, therefore, that in this one Church thou shalt attain to the communion of saints. Know that this one Church is the Catholic Church founded in all the world, to whose communion thou oughtest firmly to cleave. There are indeed other false churches, but have thou nothing in common with them: such as the Manichees, the Cataphrygæ, the Marcionists, or of the other heretics and schismatics, for these churches cease to be holy, inasmuch as they, being deceived by the doctrines of devils, believe and act otherwise than Christ the Lord commanded, and the Apostles ordained."[1]

We may now gather from the passages above given the general outlines of interpretation.

1. They assert, first, that as there was only one

[1] S. Nicetæ Explanatio Symboli, p. 44. Romæ, 1827.

congregation of Israel, so there is only one visible Church in the world.

2. Secondly, that it is holy, as being the temple of God.

3. Thirdly, that this one Church is not restricted to one nation, as Israel, but has received the dowry of all nations, and is therefore Catholic.

4. Fourthly, that it contains the saints, as of all nations so of all times, and is, therefore, a body partly visible and partly invisible.

5. Fifthly, that neither heretics, howsoever nearly they may approach the true faith, nor schismatics, though they may hold the true faith entire, are members of the one Church.

Whether right or wrong, these positions are asserted by St. Cyril, Ruffinus, St. Augustin, the anonymous expositor, and by Nicetas.

But as the earliest of these writers lived in the fourth century, and as their expositions may be suspected of a narrowness arising from the compendious way in which it was necessary to instruct candidates for baptism, we will go on to examine in the treatises of the fathers written at large, and designed for the fully instructed members of the Church, how far these expositions are a fair and exact statement of Catholic doctrine.

We will first examine such passages as relate to that part of the one Holy Church which is visible in the world.

St. Irenæus says that "God led Abraham and

his seed into the kingdom of Heaven, which is the Church through Jesus Christ, to whom is given the adoption and the inheritance which was promised to Abraham." [1] In another place he says, that "As Jacob took the blessing from Esau, so the latter people (*i. e.* the Church) took away the blessing from the former (*i. e.* from the Jews), for which cause he suffered the plots and persecutions of his brother, as the Church also suffers the same from the Jews. The twelve tribes, the family of Israel, were born in a strange land, as Christ also began to form among strangers the twelve-pillared foundation of the Church;" [2] and afterwards, "For the whole going forth of the people of God from Egypt was a type and image of the going forth of the Church which should be among the Gentiles: for this also, in the end, He led the Church towards its inheritance, which not Moses the servant of God, but Jesus the Son of God, shall give in possession." [3] And the Church thus prefigured and adumbrated by Israel, St. Irenæus describes as "scattered abroad throughout the world .... dwelling as it were in one house .... having one soul, one and the same heart .... and teaching with one mouth." [4]

The language of Tertullian is to the same effect. The Apostles, he says, "went into all the world and

[1] S. Irenæus, lib. iv. viii. p. 236. ed. Ben.
[2] Ibid. lib. iv. c. xxi. [3] Ibid. lib. iv. c. xxx.
[4] Ibid. lib. i. cx.

preached the same doctrine of the same faith to the nations, and founded Churches in every city, from which afterwards the rest of the Churches borrowed the line of the faith and the seeds of doctrine, and do daily borrow it, and so become Churches. And for this cause they also are reputed Apostolical, being the offspring of Apostolical Churches. Every family must be traced back to its original; therefore these so many and great Churches are that one first Church which the Apostles founded, from which all are sprung. So all are primitive and all Apostolical, so long as all are one. The proof of unity is the participation of peace, the salutation of brotherhood, and the interchange of hospitality." [1]

St. Clement of Alexandria writes, " Wherefore I conceive it has been made manifest by what has deen said, that the true Church, the Church which is indeed primitive, is one, into which the just according to the purpose (of God) are gathered. For God being one and the Lord one, therefore whatever is most highly precious is praised in respect that it stands alone, being a likeness of the one first principle. In the nature, however, of the One partaketh that One Church which heresies violently strive to rend into many: wherefore in its substance, and its mind, and its principle, and its excellence, we declare the primitive and Catholic Church to be one only, unto the unity of the one faith, which is according to the several cove-

[1] Tertull. de præscr. Hæret. c. xx. Opuscula. ed. Routh.

nants, or rather according to the one covenant at divers times, which by the will of one God, through one Lord, gathers together those that are ordained whom God hath predestinated, having known before the foundation of the world that they would be righteous. Wherefore the excellence of the Church, like the principle of its constitution, is in its oneness, thereby transcending all other things, and having nothing like or equal to it." [1] In another place he calls it "the gathering together of the elect." [2]

The testimony of St. Cyprian is so well known that I need quote no more than one passage from his treatise on the Unity of the Church.

After showing that our Lord singled out St. Peter, and made him a type of Unity by giving first to one alone the power of the keys, he says, "For the inculcation of Unity, He disposed by his authority that the beginning of that Unity should have its rise in one. The other Apostles were what Peter was—endowed with a like share of honour and power, but the beginning was made from one, that the Church might be shown to be one. . . . . The Apostle Paul teaches the same thing, and shows forth the mystery of Unity, when he says, 'There is one body and one Spirit, and one hope of your calling, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God.' . . . . . The Church is one, which by

[1] S. Clem. Alex. Strom. vii. 17. tom. ii. 899.
[2] Ibid. vii. 6. tom ii. p. 846

the growth of its fruitfulness is spread widely into a multitude: as there are many rays of the sun but one light, and many branches of a tree but one trunk planted in the clinging root, and though from one fountain many rivers flow, so that there seem to be many several streams by reason of the fulness of the abundant flood, yet is the oneness maintained in the original spring. Take off a ray from the body of the sun, the unity of light admits no division; cut off a stream from the fountain, that which is cut off dries up: so the Church, filled throughout with the light of the Lord, spreads its rays through the whole world; yet is it only one light which is everywhere diffused; nor is the Unity of the body severed: by reason of its abundant fulness it stretches its rays into all the earth; it pours widely forth its flowing streams, yet is there one head, and one beginning, and one mother, teeming with continual fruitfulness." [1]

So also St. Justin Martyr, in his dialogue with Trypho, speaks of the visible Unity of the Church as prefigured in the synagogue, and adumbrated by Pharaoh's daughter in the forty-fifth Psalm: "And to them that believe in Him (Christ) as being one soul, and one synagogue, and one Church, the word of God is spoken as to a daughter, to the Church that is, which is formed of His name, and partakes of His name (for we are all called Christians). The words (of the Psalm) with equal

[1] S. Cyprian de Unit. Ecclesiæ.

clearness declare, teaching us to forget the ancient customs of our fathers, thus saying, 'Hear then, O daughter, and consider,' &c."[1]

And also in another place he says, "As we see in the body, although the members be many in number, all are called one body, so also the people and the Church are many several men in number, but they are one Being, and are called, and addressed by one appellation."[2]

In like manner St. Basil says, on the twenty-ninth Psalm, "'Worship the Lord in His holy court.' It is no worship which is offered out of the Church, but only in the court of God. Do not imagine to yourselves private courts and synagogues. There is one holy court of God. The synagogue of the Jews was aforetime that court, but, after their sin against Christ, their house was left unto them desolate. Wherefore the Lord says, 'And other sheep I have which are not of this fold' (*ἀυλῆ*), meaning them who from the Gentiles were predestinated to salvation. He shows that He has another court besides that of the Jews; wherefore it is not meet to worship God out of this holy court, but within it. . . . . Wherefore they that are planted in the house of the Lord, which is the Church of the living God, shall flourish in the courts of our God."[3]

Parallel with this are the words of Lactantius. After speaking of sects which by unbelief and schism

[1] S. Just. Mar. Dial. cum Tryph. sect. 63. [2] Ibid. sect. 42.
[3] S. Basil. Hom. in Psalm xxviii (al. xxix.) sect. 3.

had forfeited the name of Christian, he adds: "That, therefore, alone is the Catholic Church which retains the true worship. This is the fountain of truth, this the home of the faith, this the temple of God, into which if any man enter not, or from which if any man go out, he is a stranger to the hope of life and everlasting salvation." [1]

St. Ambrose, commenting on the works of the third day, interprets the gathering together of the waters as a type of the Church. "From every valley a Catholic people is gathered together. Now there are not many congregations, but the congregation is one, the Church is one." [2]

Epiphanius also, after quoting the well-known text, "My dove is one," says: "For the Church is begotten of one faith, being born of the Holy Ghost, the only daughter of one only mother, and the only one to her that bare her. As many as came after her and before her were called harlots, who nevertheless were not altogether aliens from the covenant and the inheritance, but had received no dowry from the Word, nor any visitation of the Holy Ghost." [3]

But of all the writers of the early Church there is no one from whose works so many and so direct statements of the Unity of the Church may be extracted as from those of St. Augustin. The

[1] Lactantius de verâ Sap. lib. iv. 30.
[2] S. Ambrose. Hexaemer. lib. iii. ed. Ben.
[3] Epiph. adv. Hær. lib. iii. tom. ii. 6.

greater part of his life was laboriously spent in winning schismatics to the Unity of the Church. His polemical writings were drawn from him by these duties, and they wear the form and exhibit the impress of this great doctrine with a severity and truth which conflict with error seems alone to give. The chief difficulty in using the testimony of St. Augustin is, to know what to omit and what to choose. I shall give only one or two passages under this head, as we shall necessarily return to his works hereafter. In his instructions to Catechumens, he says, "All those things which we see accomplished in the name of Christ in the Church of God, and throughout the whole earth, were foretold before the world; and as we read, so we see them fulfilled, whereby we are built up in faith. For once there was brought on the whole earth a deluge, for the destruction of sinners; and they who escaped in the ark exhibited a type of the Church which should be afterwards, which now floats upon the waves of this world, and is saved from drowning by the wood of Christ's cross. To Abraham, the servant of God, one single man, it was foretold that from him a people should be born, who should worship the one God in the midst of the other nations who worshipped idols; and all things which were foretold as happening to that people came to pass as they were foretold. It was prophesied also that of that people should come Christ, the King and God of all saints, of the seed of

the same Abraham according to the flesh, which He took upon him, that all who should imitate His faith might be the children of Abraham; and so it was fulfilled. Christ was born of the Virgin Mary, who was of that family. It was foretold by the prophets that He should suffer on the cross at the hands of the same people, of the Jews from whose stock He came according to the flesh; and so it was fulfilled. It was foretold that He should rise again: He rose, and according to the predictions of the prophets ascended into Heaven, and sent the Holy Ghost to His disciples. It was foretold not only by the prophets, but also by our Lord Jesus Christ Himself, that His Church should be throughout the whole world, spread abroad by the sufferings and martyrdom of the saints. And it was foretold at a time when as yet His name was unknown among the Gentiles, and, when it was known, held in contempt; and yet, by the power of his miracles which He wrought, both himself and by his servants, while these things are announced and believed, we see the prophecy even now fulfilled; and the very kings of the earth, who before persecuted the Christians, now subjugated to the name of Christ. It was foretold that schisms and heresies should go forth out of the Church, and, under the name of Christ, wheresoever they can, seek their own and not His glory; and these things are fulfilled." [1]

In another place he says, "The Church stands

[1] S. Aug. de Catech. Rudibus, 53.

forth glorious and visible to all; for it is a city built on a hill which cannot be hid, by which Christ reigns from sea to sea, from the river to the ends of the earth, as the seed of Abraham multiplied like the stars of heaven, and as the sand of the sea, in whom all nations are blessed."[1]

"Hence it is that no man can fail to see the true Church. Therefore the Lord himself said in the Gospel, 'A city built on a hill cannot be hid.'"[2]

One more quotation shall close this list. Theodoret, commenting on the forty-seventh Psalm, after applying to the words, "The city of our God, even upon His holy hill," the saying of our Lord that a city built on a hill cannot be hid, goes on to say, "There is one Church in all the earth and sea, wherefore in our prayers we say (we pray) for the holy and only Catholic and Apostolic Church, from one end of the world to the other. But this (Church) is further divided according to the cities, and villages, and lands, which the prophetical language calls habitations (*βάρεις*).[3] . . . As each city has within it many several houses, but is nevertheless named one city, so are there ten thousand, yea innumerable Churches, in the isles and on the continent; but all in common make up one Church, being united by the harmony of true doctrines."[4]

Enough has been now adduced to show that the

[1] S. Aug. Contra Crescon. Donat. lib. ii. 36.
[2] Contra literas Petil. ii. 74.
[3] Engl. Tr. "palaces."
[4] Theodoret in Psalm. 47.

early Christian teachers held and taught that the one Church is the antitype of the ark, the family of Abraham, the people of Israel descended from the twelve patriarchs; that it is the bride and the body of Christ—a sole, definite, visible system, easily distinguishable from all heretical and schismatical bodies; and that in this primarily consists the Unity of the Church.

This will be more manifest, if we consider for a moment with how constant and unanimous a voice the same Christian teachers declare that no heretics, nor schismatics, are members of the one Church. They maintained not only that gainsayers of the Christian faith were cut off from the one body, but also that they who, even though they held the whole doctrine of Christianity in its soundness, yet broke from the communion of the visible body, were also excluded from the Church.

We may exhibit the mind of the early Christians upon this point by referring to the works of St. Cyprian and St. Augustin, who were respectively engaged in reducing a schismatical congregation to the Unity of the Church. It is to be observed that in neither case was there any disputed point of doctrine. The whole controversy turned upon a breach which had been made in the Unity of the Catholic Church.

In the case of St. Cyprian a schism had been formed, both in the African Church and at Rome, by Felicissimus, who had been schismatically or-

dained deacon, and by Novatian, who claimed the see of Rome against Cornelius. It was on this occasion that St. Cyprian wrote his Treatise on the Unity of the Church, in which he says, "Whosoever is separate from the Church is joined to an adulteress; he is severed from the promises of the Church; he is an alien, a profane man, and an enemy. He can no longer have God for his Father who has not the Church for his mother. If any one who was out of the ark of Noah could escape, then he also that is not of the Church shall escape." [1]

And again, in his letter to Antonianus, he says, "As for Novatian himself, my dearest brother, concerning whom you desired to hear what heresy he had introduced, know in the first place that we ought not even to be curious to inquire what his teaching is, forasmuch as he teaches out of the Church. Whosoever and whatsoever any man may be, he is no Christian who is not in Christ's Church. Although he boast himself, and declaim with proud words of his philosophy and eloquence, he that does not hold to brotherly love, and the Unity of the Church, has forfeited even what he was before." [2]

In the same way, St. Augustin, writing of the Donatists, says, "Christ is both the head and the body: the only begotten Son of God is the Head;

[1] S. Cyprian De Unitate Ecclesiæ.
[2] Ad Anton. Ep. lii. ed. Ben

the body is His Church, the bridegroom and the bride, two in one flesh. Whosoever agree not with Holy Scripture, touching the Head, though they be in all places where the Church is known, are not in the Church; and again, whosoever agree with Holy Scripture, touching the Head, but communicate not with the Unity of the Church, are not in the Church, because they agree not concerning the body of Christ, which is the Church, according to the testimony of Christ himself. For instance, they who do not believe that Christ came in the flesh of the Virgin Mary, of the seed of David, which the Scriptures of God declare most plainly, or that he did not rise again in the body in which he was crucified and buried, even though they should be found in all lands wherever the Church is found, they are therefore not in the Church, because they do not hold the Head of the Church, which is Christ Jesus; and they are not deceived by any obscurity of the Divine Scriptures, but they contradict the most notorious and plainest testimonies. Also, whosoever believe indeed that Christ Jesus came in the flesh, as has been said, and rose again in the same flesh in which he was born and suffered, and is Himself the Son of God, God with God, and one with the Father, the incommunicable Word of the Father, by whom all things were made, but yet so dissent from His body, which is the Church, that they do not communicate with it as it is everywhere spread abroad, and are found separated in some

particular spot, it is manifest that they are not in the Catholic Church."[1]

One more passage will bring this to a most exact expression of the primitive doctrine.

St. Augustin, writing to Vincentius, says, "All the sacraments of the Lord are derived from the Catholic Church, which you still have and administer as they were wont to be held and given, even before you went out (of the Church). It is not that you therefore have not these things because you are not there, whence the things you possess are derived. We do not change those things in you wherein we are with you, for in many things ye are with us: for of such persons it is said, 'that in many things they were with me;'[2] but we correct those things in which you are not with us, and we desire you to receive here those things which ye have not where ye are: for ye are with us in Baptism, in the Creed, in the other mysteries of the Lord; but in the spirit of unity and the bond of peace, above all, in the Catholic Church, ye are not with us."[3]

From these passages it is evident that the one Church had a certain visible system of which they that were separated from it did not partake; and that this system, whatsoever it be, is that character to which the types and shadows of the ark, the temple, and the fold were held to refer. It was evidently

[1] De Unitate Eccl. c. iv. Tom. ix. ed. Ben.

[2] Psalm liv. 19; al. lv. 18.

[3] S. August. ad Vincent. Rogatist. Ep. xciii. xi. t. ii. 249.

something external and organic. We will examine therefore what was that condition which determined whether or no a man holding the faith and sacraments, as the Donatists held them, were within or without the Church of Christ; and with this inquiry we will close the portion of the subject which relates to the visible part of the one Church.

St. Augustin objects against the Donatists that they had separated themselves from the Catholic bishops:—"We may not assent to the teaching even of the Catholic bishops, if at any time they are deceived into opinions contrary to the canonical Scriptures of God; but if they should so fall into error, and yet maintain the bond of unity and charity, let the apostle's saying avail in their case: 'And if in anything ye are otherwise minded, God shall reveal even this unto you.' Now these divine words have so manifest an application to the whole Church, that none but heretics in their stubborn perverseness and blind fury can bark against them."[1]

In like manner St. Cyprian:—"This unity we ought firmly to hold and contend for, especially we who are bishops, who preside in the Church, that we may exhibit the episcopate also one and undivided. . . . The episcopate is one of which each holds in full a common share."[2]

"Such an one is to be abhorred and avoided, being separated from the Church. Such an one is perverse, and sinneth, and is condemned of him-

[1] De Unitate Eccl. 29. [2] S. Cyprian, de Unit. Eccl.

self. Does he think himself to be with Christ, who sets himself against the priests of Christ—who severs himself from the fellowship of His clergy and people? He bears arms against the Church, and strives against the dispensation of God, being an enemy of the altar, a rebel against the sacrifice of Christ, for faith perfidious, for religion sacrilegious, a disobedient servant, an impious son, an hostile brother, despising the bishops and forsaking the priests of God, he dares to set up another altar."[1]

And in the letter to Antonianus, before quoted, he says of Novatian:—"There being one Church founded by Christ, divided into many members throughout the world, also one Episcopate spread abroad in the accordant multitude of many bishops, he, after this tradition of God, after the connecting and joining together in all places of the Unity of the Catholic Church, endeavours to set up a human Church, and sends these new apostles of his into many cities, to establish the new foundations of his institution; and seeing that there are in all provinces, and in every several city, bishops already constituted, ancient in age, in faith perfect, in straits approved, in persecution proscribed, he has the hardihood to erect other mock-bishops over them, as if he could traverse the whole world in the stubbornness of his new attempt, or break up the compactness of the ecclesiastical body by the sowing of his discord."[2]

[1] S. Cyprian. de Unit. Ecclesiæ.
[2] Ad Anton. Ep. lii. ed. Ben.

And in his answer to Cornelius concerning the offences of Novatian, St. Cyprian says, that after making a schism at Carthage he went to Rome, and strove to do the same: "Severing a portion of the people from the clergy, and cutting asunder the concord of a firmly-united, mutually-attached brotherhood. . . . . He who in one place had made a deacon in opposition to the Church, in the other made a bishop. . . . . They cannot remain in the Church of God who do not maintain the discipline ordained by God and the Church, by the tenor of their actions, and the peaceableness of their dispositions."[1]

And a little afterwards:—"He that is not planted in the precepts and counsels of God the Father, he only can depart from the Church; he only, after forsaking the bishops, persists in his madness among heretics and schismatics."[2]

In exactly the same sense, St. Ignatius writes to the Philadelphians:—"Do not err, my brethren. If any man follow a schismatic, he shall not inherit the kingdom of God. . . . Take good heed then to partake of one Eucharist: for there is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one cup for the uniting us in his blood, one altar; as also there is one Bishop with the presbyters and deacons, my fellow-servants."[3]

Also, in his epistle to the Trallians, he says:—"In like manner, let all reverence the deacons, as

[1] Ad Cornel. Ep. xlix. ed. Ben. [2] Ibid.
[3] S. Ignat. ad Philad.

also the bishops, as Jesus Christ, who is the Son of the Father; and the presbyters as the Council of God, and as the bond of the apostles: apart from these the name of Church is not."[1] And "He that does anything without the bishop, and presbytery, and deacon is not of a pure conscience."[2]

With one passage to the same effect from St. Irenæus, we will conclude this head:—"Wherefore," he says, "we must obey those who are in the Church: the presbyters, who have succession from the apostles, as we have shown, who, together with the succession of the Episcopate, received the sure gift of truth according to the good pleasure of the Father; but others who withdraw from the chief succession, and assemble in any place, we ought to hold in suspicion, either as heretics and of evil opinions, or as schismatical through pride, and self-pleasing; or, again, as hypocrites who do it for the sake of gain or vain-glory. All these have fallen from the truth. The heretics, indeed, bringing strange fire to the altar of God—that is, strange doctrines—shall be consumed by fire from heaven, as Nadab and Abihu; and they that rise up against the truth, and stir up others against the Church of God, shall abide in the pit, swallowed by the yawning of the earth, as Corah, Dathan, and Abiram with their followers; but they who rend and sever the Unity of the Church shall receive from God the same punishment as Jeroboam."[3]

[1] S. Ignat. ad Trall. [2] Ibid. [3] S. Iren. adv. Hær. lib. iv. 26.

From these passages, especially from the last sentence of that now quoted, it is evident that the sin of schism consisted in separating from the divinely-ordained priesthood and polity of the Church, and in usurping the power to constitute a new priesthood and polity, beside the one Church of Christ; and in this consists the visible unity of the one body, that it had throughout the world a visible system governed by rulers ordained of God. The universal college of Catholic bishops, with their several flocks (*plebs pastori adunata*), made up the Church of Christ, and the one fold of the one Pastor.

The question whether or no any man were in that one fold they looked on as equivalent to the question whether or no he were subject to the Catholic pastors, and in communion with their flock.

We have now examined the chief points relating to that part of the one Church which was visible in the world; and the reader will judge whether or no, in the following summary, the mind of the Christian writers whose works we have quoted be fairly represented.

They held and taught that there is in the world one visible body, which is the Church.

That its oneness consists in having one origin: one object in faith, one succession and polity, and one Head, which is Christ. This may be called its organic oneness.

That, further, it is one in the spiritual graces of

peace, charity, submission to spiritual guides, and in brotherly communion among the pastors and members of the flock. This may be called its moral oneness.

We have now to examine the teaching of the early Christians respecting that portion of the one Church which is invisible. They believed in the personal oneness of the whole body, and taught that the visibleness or invisibleness of its parts was an accident. This we see at once from the answer of St. Augustin to the Donatists, who charged the Catholics with making two Churches, because they taught that the visible Church is imperfect, the invisible perfect in holiness. "The Catholics," he says, "refuted this calumny about the two Churches, at the same time showing more distinctly their meaning, namely, that they did not hold that the Church which has a mixture of evil men in it is severed from the kingdom of God, where evil men shall not be mingled, but that the very same one holy Church is now under one condition and shall hereafter be under another: that it now has a mixture of evil men, and then shall not have any: as it is now mortal, because made up of mortal men, but shall then be immortal, because there shall be in it no one who can any more die even in the body; just as there were not therefore two Christs, because first he died, and afterwards dieth no more."[1] But in this invisible

[1] S. Aug. Brevic. Coll. cum Donatist. c. x. tom. ix. ed. Ben.

portion of the one Church they taught that as there were gathered in one the saints of all nations, so there were the saints of all dispensations and times.

This we will go on to show, as before, by citations.

The first we may adduce is from the Shepherd of Hermas. The allegorical form of this work, if it take from its weight as an exact exposition of doctrine, is, for the same reason, more favourable as giving opportunity for a full exhibition of the writer's belief.

After adumbrating the Church as a tower built upon the water, he adds, "Hear now also concerning the stones that are in the building. The square and white stones, which agree exactly in their joints, are the apostles, and bishops, and doctors, and ministers, who through the mercy of God have come in and governed, and taught, and ministered holily and modestly to the elect of God; both they who are fallen asleep and they who yet remain, who have always agreed with them, and have had peace among themselves, and have obeyed each other. For which cause their joints exactly meet together in the building of the tower. They which are drawn out of the deep and put into the building, and whose joints agree with the other stones which are already built, are those which are already fallen asleep, and have suffered for the sake of the Lord's name." [1]

[1] S. Hermæ, Vis. iii. s. 5.

And in his ninth Similitude he says, "What are these stones which were taken out of the deep and fitted into the building? The ten, said he, which were placed at the foundation are the first age, the following five-and-twenty the second, of righteous men. The next thirty-five are the prophets and ministers of the Lord; and the forty are the apostles and doctors of the preaching of the Son of God."[1] And a little after: "And I said, Sir, show me this farther. He answered, What dost thou ask? Why did these stones come out of the deep, and were placed into the building of this tower, seeing that they long ago carried those holy spirits? It was necessary, said he, for them to ascend by water, that they might be at rest; for they could not otherwise enter the kingdom of God but by laying aside the mortality of their former life. They therefore being dead were nevertheless sealed with the seal of the Son of God, and so entered into the kingdom of God. For before a man receives the name of the Son of God, he is ordained unto death; but when he receives that seal, he is freed from death and assigned unto life. Now, that seal is the water of baptism, into which men go down under the obligation unto death, but come up appointed unto life. Wherefore to those also was this seal preached, and they made use of it, that they might enter into the kingdom of God. And I said, Why, then, Sir, did

[1] S. Hermæ Simil. ix. s. 15.

these forty stones also ascend with them out of the deep, having already received that seal? He answered, Because these apostles and teachers, who preached the name of the Son of God, dying after they had received his faith and power, preached to those who were dead before, and they gave this seal to them. They went down, therefore, into the water with them and again came up. But these went down whilst they were alive, and came up again alive: whereas those who were before dead went down dead, but came up alive. Through these, therefore, they received life, and knew the Son of God. For which cause they came up with them, and were fit to come into the building of the tower; and were not cut, but put in entire, because they died in righteousness, and in great purity, only this seal was wanting to them."[1]

St. Clement, in his Epistle to the Corinthians, says, "Let us look stedfastly unto the blood of Christ, and see how precious unto God is his blood which was shed for our salvation, and hath brought to the whole world the grace of repentance. Let us stedfastly look at all generations, and learn that from generation to generation the Lord hath given a place of repentance to those that turned to Him. Noah preached repentance, and those that heard him were saved. Jonah preached conversion to the Ninevites, and they that repented of their sins turned away the wrath of God by their prayers

[1] S. Hermæ Simil. ix. 16. vid. S. Clem. Alex. Strom. ii. 9. 452.

and were saved, although they were aliens from God."[1]

St. Irenæus, speaking of Abraham, teaches that he was a type of both testaments: "that he might become the father of all who follow the word of God and endure the pilgrimage of this world, that is, of all who are faithful both from the circumcision and uncircumcision; as Christ is the chief corner-stone which upholds all things, and gathers together into the one faith of Abraham those who in both Testaments are fit for the building of God."[2]

The same we have already seen in Clement of Alexandria[3] and Nicetas.[4]

But the most explicit declarations of this view are to be found in the works of St. Augustin. After speaking of the book of Job, he adds, "I do not doubt that this was divinely provided, that by this one proof we might know that there may be even among other nations those who walked with God, and pleased him, and belong to the spiritual Jerusalem, which we can believe was conceded to no one but to those to whom had been divinely revealed the one mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus, who to the saints of old was foretold as to come, even as he is declared to us as come already, that one and the same faith through

[1] S. Clem. ad Cor., Ep. i. 7.
[2] S. Irenæus, adv. Hær. lib. iv. xxv.
[3] S. Clem. Alex. tom. ii. 899. [4] S. Nicetæ Opp. 43.

Him might lead all the predestinate into the city of God, the house of God, the temple of God."[1]

In another place, also, speaking of the saints before Christ's coming, he says, they "were citizens of that holy city," and "were members of Christ's Church although they lived before Christ our Lord was born in the flesh. For He the only begotten Son of God, the Word of His Father, equal and co-eternal with the Father, by whom all things were made, was made man for us, that He might be the head of the whole Church as of the whole body. So all the saints who were on earth before the nativity of our Lord Jesus Christ, although born beforehand, yet were united under their head to that universal body of which He is the head."[2]

"The body of this head is the Church, not that which is in this place, but both in this place and in all the world; not that which is at this time, but from Abel to those who shall be born even unto the end, and shall believe in Christ: the whole people of the saints belong to one city, which city is the body of Christ, of which Christ is head. Thus also the angels are our fellow-citizens: only, as strangers, far from home, we are toiling; while they in the city await our coming. And from that city, from which we are absent far off, letters have come to us, which are the Scriptures, &c."[3]

And again, speaking of Canaan, he says, "There

[1] De Civ. Dei, lib. xviii. 47. tom. vi. ed. Ben.
[2] De Catech. rud. 33. tom. vii.
[3] Enarratio in Ps. xc. Sermo. 2.

was built Jerusalem, the illustrious city of God, which served as a sign of the city which is free, which is called the Heavenly Jerusalem. Of which all sanctified men who ever were, who are, and who shall be, are citizens, and every holy spirit, even they that in the highest heavens obey God with pious devotion. Of this city the Lord Jesus Christ is king; the Word of God by whom the highest angels are ruled; the Word that took man's nature, that men also might be ruled by Him, who shall also reign with Him in everlasting peace." [1]

And in another place, "The temple of God, that is of the whole highest Trinity, is the Holy Church, namely, the Universal Church in Heaven and earth." [2] "This Church, therefore, which is made up of the holy angels and powers of God, will then become known to us as it really is, when we are finally joined to it to enjoy together with it everlasting bliss. But that Church which is afar off from it in its pilgrimage on earth, is by so much the more known to us, for that we are in it; and it is made up of men, which also we are. This Church is redeemed from all sin by the blood of the Mediator, who is without sin. Christ did not, indeed, die for the angels; and yet even the angels are partakers of this mystery, when any portion soever of mankind is redeemed and delivered from

[1] S. Aug. de Catech. rud. 36. Conf. Enarr. in Psalm xxxvi. v. Serm. 3.

[2] Enchiridion de Fide Spe et Caritate, c. lvi. tom. vi. 218.

evil by His death. Since, in a certain sense, mankind returns to favour with them, after the enmity which sin wrought between men and the holy angels; and by the same redemption of man the fall of the angels is restored; and the holy angels being taught of God, by the eternal contemplation of whose truth they are blessed, know what number of the family of man the perfection of that city waits for to fulfil its complement. Wherefore the Apostle says, 'to restore all things in Christ, which are in Heaven and which are in earth, even in Him.' For the things in Heaven are restored when the fall of angels is restored from among mankind; and things in earth are restored when men who are predestinated to eternal life are renewed from the oldness of corruption. And thus by that one sacrifice in which the Mediator was slain, which one sacrifice the many victims in the law figured forth, heavenly things were reconciled with earthly, and earthly with heavenly. As also, the Apostle says, 'It pleased Him that in Him should all fullness dwell; and by Him to reconcile all things to Himself, making peace by the blood of His cross, whether they be things in earth or things in heaven.'"[1]

I will add only one more passage: "Let no man be deceived. Even the things in Heaven, and the glory of the angels, and the principalities visible and invisible, unless they believe in the blood of

[1] Enchirid. de Fide, &c. c. lxi.

Christ, shall be brought into judgment. He that can receive it let him receive it." [1]

From these passages it is evident that they believed the saints of all ages to be members of the one Church, and that they who fell asleep before Christ's coming were engrafted into it by some mysterious action in the invisible world. [2] All holy angels, and all spirits of just men made perfect, under Christ their Head, made up the unseen portion of the one Church. And of this we have very full and striking evidence in two primitive usages. The first being the commemoration and commendation of the departed faithful, which in all Liturgies, as in those ascribed to St. Chrysostom, St. Basil, St. Gregory, and to the Apostles, runs nearly in the same form. In the suffrages for the whole Catholic Church they were ever wont to testify the oneness of the visible and invisible parts, saying, "Further, O Lord, vouchsafe to remember them also who, from the beginning of the world, have pleased thee, the holy fathers, patriarchs, apostles, prophets, preachers, evangelists, martyrs, confessors, and every just spirit made perfect in the faith of Christ." [3]

The other usage to which I refer shows that they believed the visible part to have not only union, but communion of energy and worship with the part in-

[1] S. Ignat. ad Smyrnæos.
[2] S. Cyril. Hier. Cat. xiii. 31, and S. Hermas, ut supra, p. 59.
[3] Liturg. S. Basil. Opp. tom. ii. p. 680.

visible. In the same Eucharistical office was always used the Seraphic Hymn or Trisagium, in which the earthly and heavenly Church were believed to join. The following passages will represent the common faith of the early teachers on this point. Speaking of this hymn, St. Chrysostom says, "Know ye this voice? Whether is it ours or the seraphims'? Both ours and the seraphims' through Christ, who hath taken away the middle wall of partition, and reconciled things in Heaven and things in earth, making both one. For aforetime this hymn was sung in Heaven alone; but when the Lord vouchsafed to come down on earth he brought down to us also this melody. Wherefore the chief priest (*i. e.* the Bishop), when he stands at the holy table, offering the reasonable service, and making oblation of the unbloody sacrifice, does not merely call us to this chant, but after naming the cherubim and seraphim, then exhorts every one to send forth this awful song, drawing our thoughts from the earth by the remembrance of those that chant with us, and almost crying to each of us and saying, 'Thou singest with the seraphim, stand then with the seraphim, spread thy wings with them, with them hover round the royal throne.'"[1] They believed that the acts of homage and adoration offered by the visible were assisted by the invisible members of the Church; that they bore a part in all the ghostly energies of that body of which the Church mili-

[1] S. Chrys. Hom. vi. in Esai. t. iii. 890.

tant is the lower portion, and Christ the common Head.

It would be very easy to multiply, to an indefinite extent, passages which bear upon the points under consideration. But knowing how irksome it is to read over a series of quotations, I have endeavoured to make them as few as possible. With this view I have used the best judgment I was able in selecting such as seemed clear enough to exhibit the mind of the early Church.

Once more, let me remind the reader that the only point in which he need as yet apply his critical skill is, whether or no the following summary be a fair and exact representation of the sense of the writers here adduced.

It would seem that they believed the one Church to consist of the body of faithful of all nations and of all ages, gathered under Christ their Head; and that of this body there are two parts, one visible and one invisible, between which there nevertheless subsists the most strict and energetic personal union: that the invisible part is perfect and admitted into the fellowship of angels; and the visible imperfect, having in it a mixture of evil men, and that its unity is twofold, organic in its origin and polity, and moral in peace and charity; the visible mark or character of unity being communion with pastors deriving lawful succession from the Apostles of Christ.

CHAPTER III.

THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH AS TAUGHT IN HOLY SCRIPTURE.

HITHERTO I have attempted only to ascertain in what sense the doctrine of the Unity of the Church was held in the first ages. If I have faithfully exhibited the mind of the early teachers of Christ's Gospel, I have fulfilled the work I undertook. Whether that doctrine which has been exhibited be true or not is a further question, on which I have as yet made no assertion. Henceforward I shall endeavour to show by a course of direct argument what is the doctrine of Unity as revealed by Jesus Christ. If the conclusion to which our reasoning may ultimately lead us should be found to coincide with the doctrine stated in the last chapter, it will of course amount to an independent proof that the same doctrine is true. I say independent; for it must always be borne in mind that, even though the arguments of this present chapter should appear inconclusive, the statements in the last constitute

a distinct and separate fact, which, if supposed to be untrue, must be explained away or accounted for.

I will, however, assert nothing upon the witness of the early Church. I will not as yet use it even for the enunciation of our present argument. But, as we have ascertained by detailed examination what was the doctrine of Unity taught by the uninspired writers, we will now follow exactly the same course with the inspired teachers of the Church. The whole of this chapter, therefore, will rest upon the canonical books of Scripture.

That the Unity of the Church in some sense is a doctrine of Holy Scripture every Christian man admits. So far there is no controversy. In what sense this Unity is to be believed, whether as wholly visible and outward, or wholly inward and invisible, or in a mixed, various, and changeable shape—this is the only dispute. It is plain, therefore, that if the text of Holy Scripture can be variously interpreted, every man will claim its witness for himself, as every several man believes the eye of a picture to be fixed on him alone. But it is obvious that to call any proposition alleged from Scripture a *proof* from Scripture, until it is first proved to be the right sense of Scripture, is only to beg the question at every step. The point at issue is plainly this: of many apparent senses of Scripture, which is the true? He that has it has Scripture on his side, and he only.

I am aware, therefore, that in professing to derive

the proof of this chapter from Holy Scripture, I lay myself open to the preliminary objection, that the words of Scripture are not proof from Scripture till I have proved that they are adduced according to the mind and intention of the writer. This, therefore, is the real point. Every thoughtful man will admit that although, in the manifold wisdom of God, His Word may have, as it were, many sides, and every saying of it many aspects, yet it can only be so as any perfect though complex figure may have a multitude of harmonizing lines, with an absolute unity. It savours, therefore, rather of shallowness and incoherence to hear men say that Holy Scripture has passages of a discrepant and various kind. God cannot belie himself. In the Divine mind all the ideas of eternal truth lie in perfect harmony; and all their reflections on the page ofy Hol Writ are likewise of one accord. Scattered and divergent as they may seem to our eyes, there is a point of sight at which we shall see them all rise and blend into the oneness and harmony of light.

Many, therefore, as may be the apparent senses of Scripture, there can be but one true sense. Many as may be the apparent arguments and deductions from these apparent senses, there can be but one true argument and conclusion from Holy Writ. And this we will endeavour to ascertain in the article of the Unity of the Church.

I shall, therefore, on every point, first adduce the words of Scripture.

Next, in the event of doubt as to the right interpretation of any passage, I shall adduce such other passages of Holy Scripture as may determine its sense.

And, lastly, should the interpretation be still doubtful, I shall ascertain in what sense the early uninspired writers of the Church received it. I shall use them, therefore, not as primary, but as corroborating witnesses, and shall leave for candid minds to estimate the relative weight of interpretations, of which the one shall have the authority of some few, and those modern teachers, or it may be only of an individual mind, and the other the assent and corroboration of Christians from the earliest traceable antiquity. Of such an interpretation, if we may not at once assert that it must be right, we may at least believe that it is in harmony with the Catholic faith, and may be, as it has been, held without blame by the most devoted servants of God.

Ever since the fall of man there has been in the world a fellowship of God's faithful servants. In the universal sinfulness of mankind, before the flood, there was one family, which still clave to God. In the second declension from God, which followed after the flood, there was yet a remnant. When chosen by the free grace of God, and called out of the midst of an idolatrous land and kindred, the family of Abraham alone was found faithful. When this family had grown into a tribe, and from a tribe into a nation, God was pleased to superadd the tokens and

signatures of a visible polity and priesthood. Thenceforward Israel was among nations a "kingdom of priests," a visible witness for God. After the various fortunes of fifteen hundred years, through which the visible national identity of Israel was preserved by the Divine Providence, God was pleased to continue the same visible witness of Himself in the Church of Christ. The Jewish Church was a typical Church so far as it was Jewish, that is, the national Israel was a figure of the spiritual, of "the Israel of God;" but it was a real Church in so far as it was the stock on which the Catholic Church of Christ was grafted. It is probable, therefore, that from the time of Noah, supposing a visible line from Noah to Abraham, and certain that from the time of Abraham, there has been in the world one, and one only body, a family, a nation, a Catholic fellowship, which, through the knowledge of God revealed to it alone, has fulfilled the office ascribed to it by St. Peter. "Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a peculiar people, a holy nation, to show forth the praises of Him that hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light."

At this day there is in the world a great visible witness for God, namely, the whole of Christendom. There are not two Christendoms, but one only; and in it alone is to be found the true knowledge of God revealed to mankind by His Son Jesus Christ. In this sense of Unity, which is plainly deducible from Scripture, all will readily agree.

We may remark further, that as this visible body has had three distinct stages or phases of development, the patriarchal, the national, and the Catholic, so under each several condition it has borne a distinct and visible character.

It has always been constituted as a society, of which the two main conditions were subordination and charity, the two main relations of sonship and brotherhood. This was the structure of the patriarchal family, of which there was always one head by devolution of the right of primogeniture, and one body of many members. Towards this head was the duty of subordination as of sons to a father, and towards the members of the body, of charity as of brethren one to another.

But when this family multiplied into a nation this organised system was more strongly developed. The bonds of relation by kindred were so lengthened out as to lose in the closeness of their hold, therefore God strengthened them by a direct institution. A stronger hand was needed to wield a nation than a family. For a people of twelve tribes, a more visible structure and a more consolidated polity was needful. And at this time we find a lawgiver and a priest ordained by God himself, the one to be for ever represented by the succession of the priesthood, the other by the judges and the kings.

The civil and sacerdotal polity of the Jewish nation is so legible in every part of Holy Writ, that no one has ever called it into doubt: the only ques-

tion that can be raised is, whether that polity was an economy to meet the temporary condition of a particular people, or an institution of Divine wisdom necessary to the well-being of mankind, and therefore designed to continue in the Christian Church through all ages, to the end of the world.

And, first, it will be well to remark on the nature of the chief types by which the Catholic Church was foreshadowed. The earliest is the ark of Noah; the most visible, the family of Abraham and the nation of Israel. In both these we see not more the character of unity than of structure and organisation. The ark was built by the express and detailed instruction of God: the distinctive features of the Jewish economy were of divine institution, from the seal of the Covenant given to Abraham, to the pattern shown to Moses in the Mount.

It is plain, then, that part of the moral instruction of these types was to foreshadow a coming mystery, the prominent character of which should be a structure and an organisation instituted by God himself.

The same may be traced in the language of the prophets: as where Daniel passes from the four visible empires to a fifth, which is the visible Kingdom of God; where Isaiah foretells the peace of the Church under the image of a city built of precious stones; in the whole implied meaning of the words, "Behold I lay in Sion, for a foundation, a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner stone, a sure

foundation;"[1] and in the head stone, which in due time should be brought forth with shouting.[2] All these foreshadow a structure or polity.

Other types (such as the stone which grew into a great mountain, in the vision seen by Daniel, and the figurative language of the Psalms and Song of Songs, where the Church is spoken of as the beloved and the bride) are designed to express Unity, together with some characteristic attribute, such as growth and extension, or purity and intense cleaving of love to Christ the Spouse. But as these bring out each one some peculiar property of the Church, so do the ark and the people of Israel and the like bespeak an organised system.

We may add to these the parables of our Lord, in which the Church is everywhere typified as one organised body: as for instance, those in which He likened the Kingdom of Heaven to an household, to a net, to a grain of mustard seed, to a vine. In all these continuity of parts and unity of structure are distinctly adumbrated. To the same effect also are our Lord's words, when He applied to Himself the prophecy of the stone which the builder refused; and when He said to Simon, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my Church." All these things would prepare us for some visible organised system instituted by God as the fulfilment of the types, and ordained in the stead of His former economies.

[1] Isaiah xxviii. 16. [2] Zech. iv. 7.

Now if we examine Holy Scripture simply as an authentic historical document, in which the beginnings of the Church are narrated, we shall find,—

First, that by the baptism of St. John Baptist a body of people was gathered together for the service of the Messiah. What the circumcision of Abraham was to the Mosaic polity the baptism of St. John was to the Church of Christ. Next, by the baptism in the name of Christ, the first foundations of the Church were laid. "Then they that gladly received his (Peter's) word were baptized; and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls. . . . . And they continued steadfastly in the Apostle's doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers. And the Lord added to the Church daily such as should be saved." [1] This is the first time we read of the Church as a body already in being. Our Lord had plainly spoken of it in His benediction to St. Peter, [2] but He spoke of it in promise and in prophecy. As yet it did not exist. But in the book of Acts we find His words rising up into a reality. The Church had passed into being. The faithful remnant were knit into one body, compacted by one faith and one common bond of baptism into Christ. And thenceforward the Church is spoken of as a phenomenon well known, and as a body conspicuously visible. It was a community existing in Jerusalem, and worshipping in the temple; and yet so distinct from the polity and

[1] Acts ii. 41, 42, 47. [2] St. Matth. xvi. 18; xviii. 17.

system of the Jews, as to admit its members by a formal seal of initiation in the Name of God. The Apostles baptized out of God's elder system into the new. From this time we find persecution arising against "the Church;" Saul making havock of "the Church;" prayer being made for Peter by "the Church;" Herod vexing certain of "the Church."[1]

And, again, we read of the Apostles ordaining elders in every Church; of the Churches throughout all Judea having rest; of Paul going throughout Syria confirming the Churches; of the Churches being established in the faith. And throughout the New Testament Scripture, in more than a hundred places, "the Church" is in like manner spoken of.

It is plain that this refers to some one visible organized sytem, having unity in plurality, and being therefore spoken of as existing at one and the same time, in one and in many places. And therefore the Apostolic Epistles bear the name and address of each several Church, and to the Church in each several place; and the Church is spoken of as in the house of Chloe, or of Gaius, of Philemon, and Nymphas, and the like. But this is enough to show that by "the Church" was intended some newly developed system, which at that time began to take the place of God's previous economies, and to overspread both Judea and the countries round about. Thus far we have evidence rather of the fact, that such a system was then founded, than of

[1] Acts viii. 1, 3; xii. 1, 5.

the kind and nature of the system itself. We see that it was a visible substantive body, united by symbolical bonds, and differenced from all other communities partly by the rejection of their respective characteristics, and partly by the peculiar nature of its own.

We will now examine what the inspired writers taught concerning the nature of the Church.

They explain its nature chiefly by the use of two metaphors—a building and a body.

St. Paul draws a direct parallel between the Church of the Jews and the Church of Christians. "Every house is builded by some man, but He that built all things is God. And Moses verily was faithful in all his house as a servant, for a testimony of those things which were to be spoken after. But Christ as a Son over His own house, whose house are we."[1] As he says to the Corinthians, "Ye are God's building;"[2] and again, "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God;"[3] and "the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are."[4] "Your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost."[5] "Ye are the temple of the living God."[6] "Unto whom coming," says St. Peter, "as unto a living stone, disallowed indeed of men, but chosen of God and precious. Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house."[7] Again St. Paul says, "Ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens

[1] Heb. iii. 4, 5, 6. [2] 1 Cor. iii. 9. [3] 1 Cor. iii. 16.
[4] 1 Cor. iii. 17. [5] 1 Cor. vi. 19.
[6] 2 Cor. vi. 16. [7] 1 St. Pet. ii. 4, 5.

with the saints, and of the household of God, and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner stone, in whom all the building, fitly framed together, groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord: in whom ye also are builded together from habitation of God through the Spirit."[1]

In these passages St. Paul and St. Peter teach us that what the temple in Jerusalem was to the Divine presence which dwelt in it, the fellowship of Christians is now to the indwelling presence of the Holy Ghost.

The Jewish temple was a type, being a structure of dead matter made with hands; the Church of Christ the antitype, being an aggregation of living and spiritual natures gathered into one, and held together in the same relation to Christ, the head corner-stone.

It is unnecessary to raise a question whether or no from this passage the visible Unity of the Church is to be proved, although it would seem that a congregation of living men is as visible an object as a pile of lifeless stones. Let us take only what all admit. Let us say that these passages prove only the spiritual and invisible Unity of the Church. Now no man can deny that the type of a building or temple shadows forth the properties of structure, and mutual relation of parts, and therefore of order and combination on some com-

[1] Ephes. ii. 19, 22.

mon principle no less than of unity. Nay, I think, candid reasoners will admit these to be the chief and prominent ideas expressed by the analogy. However, for our present argument, it is enough that these be admitted as features in the prophetic types and in the language of the Apostles.

The other figure commonly used by St. Paul to express the nature of Christ's Church, is that of a body.

To the Ephesians he says, that God "hath put all things under His feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the Church, which is His body, the fullness of Him that filleth all in all."[1] And to the Colossians, "He is the head of the body, the Church;"[2] and a little afterwards, "holding the head, from which all the body by joints and bands having nourishment ministered, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God."[3] "We being many are one body in Christ."[4] "As the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body, so also is Christ. For by one Spirit we are all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free, and have been all made to drink into one Spirit."[5] "Ye are the body of Christ and members in particular."[6] To the Ephesians, he says, "I therefore, the prisoner

[1] Ephes. i. 22, 23. [2] Coloss. i. 18 and 20; and iii. 15. Coloss. ii. 19. [4] Rom. xii. 4.
[5] 1 Cor. xiv. 12, 13. [6] 1 Cor. xiv. 27.

of the Lord, beseech you that ye walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called, with all lowliness and meekness, with long suffering, forbearing one another in love, endeavouring to keep the Unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. There is one body and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all. But unto every one of us is given grace according to the measure of the gift of Christ. Wherefore, he saith, when he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men. . . . . And he gave some apostles and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ, till we all come in the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ; that we henceforth be no more children tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive; but, speaking the truth in love, may grow up into Him in all things, which is the Head, even Christ; from whom the whole body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the

edifying of itself in love."[1] So to the Romans he says, "As we have many members in one body, and all members have not the same office, so we being many are one body in Christ; and every one members one of another."[2] And carrying out the same idea, he says to the Corinthians, that there are diversities of gifts, administrations, and operations; the manifestation of the Spirit being given to each man severally for his respective ministry in the edifying of the one body. "God hath set some in the Church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healing, helps, governments, diversities of tongues. Are all apostles? Are all prophets?"[3]—all parts of the body being thus tempered together with a manifold and various endowment of powers and functions, distributed to each several member for the interchange of service and reciprocal ministry, and for the ultimate well-being of the whole.

In these passages, and in many more, St. Paul shadows forth the Church under the figure of a body, and then raises the figure into a reality, so that the example or argument passes by a sort of transfiguration into the mystery of Christ's mystical body, as when he says, "We are members of His body, of His flesh, and of His bones."[4] And to this transcendent communion he likens the unity of holy wedlock. "For this cause shall a man leave his

[1] Ephes. iv. 1—16. [2] Rom. xii. 4, 5.
[3] 1 Cor. xiv. 28, 29. [4] Ephes. v. 30.

father and mother, and shall be joined unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh. This is a great mystery, but I speak concerning Christ and his Church."[1] From all this, I say, it is most evident that St. Paul intends to express not more the Unity of Christ's body than the organic structure of the Church.

But in these last passages we have arrived at a further truth, namely, that the ministry is of Divine origin and authority. St. Paul ascribes the office of apostle, prophet, evangelist, pastor, teacher, &c., to a direct institution of the Holy Spirit. This great fact runs through the whole inspired document. First, we read that Christ Himself constituted twelve to be his Apostles; next, that they by a deliberate action and purpose filled in the place of Judas with a successor to his apostolic powers; then that they ordained elders in every Church. We find St. Paul giving charge to the elders of the Asiatic Churches to feed the flock of God, over which the Holy Ghost had made them overseers: we find him laying hands on Timothy, and constituting Titus to the oversight of Crete, and instructing them in their spiritual government of the Church, and providing for the multiplication and succession of pastors. If the ministry be not of Divine origin, then surely nothing can be. Neither Baptism nor the Eucharist has more, and more self-evident proofs of being instituted

[1] Ephes. v. 31, 32.

by the act and continued by the will of Christ and of God.

But besides this we learn from the passages above cited, that the ministry of the Church was divinely appointed to be as it were the spinal chord of the whole body. It is the very condition of structure and organisation, and the divinely ordained means of growth and unity of life. I raise no question here as to the form and aspect of the polity of the Church, and speak only of the Succession of pastors deriving power from the Apostles of Christ. That this is the *differentia* of the one Church as compared with other congregations of men is evident, as we may read in Holy Scripture. We have seen that the Church "continued steadfastly in the Apostles' fellowship." We read of nascent schisms in the Churches of Galatia and Corinth, which were formed by the congregating of unstable men round teachers who professed to be Apostles of Christ. The Church of Ephesus was commended for trying them which said they were Apostles, and were not, and finding them to be liars.[1] St. Peter also writes, "There were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction. And many shall follow their pernicious ways," &c.[2] St. John, speaking of the fore-

[1] Rev. ii. 2. [2] 2 St. Pet. ii. 12.

runners of Anti-Christ in his day, says, "They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us."[1] "These be they," says St. Jude, "which separate themselves, sensual, having not the Spirit."[2] And St. Paul, "For first of all, when ye come together in the Church, I hear that there be divisions among you, and I partly believe it; for there must needs be also heresies among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest among you."[3] "Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves, for they watch for your souls as they that must give account."[4] "And we beseech you, brethren, to know them which labour among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you. And to esteem them very highly in love for their work's sake, and to be at peace among yourselves."[5]

From these passages it is plain that the divinely appointed ministry of the Church was the bond which knit together the members of Christ in one visible communion: that it was in fact the test and seal, or, so to speak, the Sacrament of order in the Church, being the idea correlative with subordination. From this also we see that they who, by false teaching or insubordinate temper, violated the Unity of the faith, or of the Christian family, ceased by that act to be any longer members of the body. This

[1] St. John ii. 19. [2] St. Jude 19. [3] 1 Cor. xi. 18, 19.
[4] Heb. xiii. 17. [5] 1 Thess. v. 12, 13.

severing from the body of Christ was twofold: either wilful, as in the case of heretics and schismatics, who separated themselves from the Church, for instance the Nicolaitans[1] and the Gnostic teachers; or penal, as in the case of the excommunicated Corinthian, who was "put away" from the body of the Church, and delivered by them "unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit might be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus."[2] And again of Hymenæus and Alexander, whom St. Paul delivered unto Satan, "that they might learn not to blaspheme."[3] To any one who will consider the nature of excommunication, and the authority by which it was inflicted, it will be abundantly plain that it signifies a judicial separation, by authoritative sentence of the spiritual rulers, from the body of Christ's Church. And this will be sufficient proof of the nature of the Church as recorded in Scripture, that it was a visible body, having an exact internal organisation, and subjected to constituted rulers. We learn also that the Unity of that body is twofold: one kind of Unity being objective, consisting in its faith, sacraments, and organised polity; the other subjective, in the peace and brotherly love of the several members.

In the foregoing pages I have gathered together such passages of Holy Writ as declare to us the nature of the one visible Church; but there are

[1] Rev. ii. 6. [2] 1 Cor. v. 13. [3] 1 Tim. i. 20.

still other declarations of the inspired writers which must be taken into view to complete the full meaning of "the Holy Church."

In writing to the Ephesians, St. Paul says that God having raised Christ from the dead, "set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named not only in this world, but also in that which is to come;"[1] and also to the Philippians that God had "exalted Him and given Him a name which is above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord."[2]

To the Colossians he writes, "Who is the image of the invisible God, the first born of every creature: for by Him were all things created that are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers, all things were created by Him and for Him; and He is before all things, and by Him all things consist, and He is the Head of the body which is the Church, who is the beginning, the first born from the dead, that in all things He might have the pre-eminence. For it pleased the Father that in Him should all fullness dwell. And having made peace through the blood of His cross by Him, to reconcile all things unto Himself

[1] Ephes. i. 20, 21. [2] Phil. ii. 9, 10, 11.

by Him; I say whether they be things in earth or things in heaven."[1]

And in like manner, teaching the Hebrew Christians how high was their calling in Christ, he says, "Ye are come unto Mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the Heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels. To the general assembly and Church of the first born which are written in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the Mediator of the New Covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, which speaketh better things than that of Abel."[2]

From these places it is evident that the incarnation and passion of the Son of God is the mysterious cause of a new order, in which even unseen and heavenly beings are partakers. The Father sent Him into the world to redeem and to regenerate the creation of God, "that in the dispensation of the fullness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are in earth."[3] How or in what manner the heavenly orders are reconstituted in a new order; whether the original sin of angels was a refusal of homage to the anticipated mystery of the Incarnate Son; whether the elect angels, as they yielded adoration to the Word made flesh, so are now partakers of a new summing up of

[1] Coloss. i. 15—20. [2] Heb. xii. 22, 23, 24.
[3] Ephes. i. 10.

God's creatures under a new Head [1] in Christ Jesus, we know not. Most evident it is that they, together with the spirits of just men made perfect, are members of Christ's mediatorial kingdom, and gathered together with the visible Church of Christ under one Head in a wonderful order. [2] They are members with us of the one mystical body, of which part is seen and part unseen.

We have now gone through the writings of the inspired teachers of the Church, so as to leave few passages, that I am aware of, bearing explicitly on the subject, untouched. And the result to which we have come is this—that the Church of Christ is a body of which one part is visible, the other invisible; that it is constituted of angels and men; and that of these some are already perfect, and some in their imperfect state; that the visible part of the one body, here on earth, is the congregation of Christian men who are under the rule of pastors deriving their succession from the Apostles of Christ.

I am not aware that I have strained the proof of any one point in this argument. I might have made it even more definite in some of its features, but I had rather draw a conclusion which should fall far within the circumference of the premises than exceed their limits by never so small an excess.

On a principle which must be obvious, I forbear

[1] ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι.

[2] Collect for the Feast of St. Michael and All Angels.

attempting to deduce from Scripture anything more than the outline of this doctrine. It is plainly not less unreasonable to look to Holy Scripture for an anticipated resolution of modern controversies than to search in it for a proof of its own inspiration. How, for instance, should we expect to find the Apostles in their own lifetime adjusting questions about the validity or invalidity of the succession? It is plain that they ordained a system in the world, which contained in it the germ of a mysterious development. The fact is sufficient proof of their intention. The founding of the Church contains in it the principle of succession, as the birth of a living soul contains a continuous personal identity.

Sufficient has, I trust, been adduced to prove that the teaching of the inspired and uninspired writers is in exact agreement.

Unless it can be shown that I have misrepresented the meaning of the Fathers or of the Apostles, I may now assume that the article in the Creed is the enunciation, the teaching of the Fathers the exposition, and the witness of Holy Scripture the proof of the doctrine of the Unity of the Church as here expressed.

CHAPTER IV.

THE FORM AND MATTER OF UNITY.

We have now ascertained, at least in outline, the nature of the Unity of the Church. If I may be allowed to use a word already forced by the poverty of our abstract language upon a well-known writer,[1] I would say that the doctrine of unity contains the ideas both of *oneliness*, and of oneness.

The *oneliness* of the Church is that which is expressed in the Creed preserved in the works of Alexander by the μίαν καὶ μόνην ἐκκλησίαν, the one, and one only Church. The oneness relates to its essential nature, and to the mode in which it is one.

Of unity, in the sense that there is one and one only Church, enough has been already said: but of unity which is the cause and reason of the *one-*

[1] Cudworth, Intell. System, p. 633, fol. 1678.

liness of the Church, we have as yet spoken only in a broad and general way. In the present chapter, therefore, we will take up this part of the subject.

I have already said that the unity of the visible part of the Church may be divided into a twofold kind, namely, organic or objective, and moral or subjective; and I will endeavour to show the nature of these two several aspects of unity, and the reason for so distinguishing them.

By the organic unity of the Church may be understood the oneness of the form and constitution which God by direct act and inspiration has ordained; as we speak of the organic nature of the world or of man, distinct from the powers of life and moral action. I would therefore use the term as co-extensive with the whole objective economy of God; including all that He has taught and ordained, or, as we are wont commonly to say, both the doctrine and discipline of the Church; and excluding all that relates to the subjective nature, condition, and probation of man.

By the moral unity of the Church may be understood the oneness of the subjective nature, condition, and character of mankind, wrought out and maintained through the organic unity of the whole dispensation; as we distinguish between the moral character and habits of a family, and the lineal descent and collateral relations which determine the unity and identity of the race.

We will now take these two points in order.

And first, under the idea of organic unity, we will comprehend both the doctrine and discipline of the Church. In exact truth, this common division is illogical, inasmuch as the several members will be found reciprocally to include a portion of the same idea. As, for instance, it does not readily appear whether we ought to refer the Holy Sacraments to the head of doctrine, or of discipline. They are doctrinal so far as they are matters of doctrine, and have a symbolical aspect to adumbrate the mystery of redemption; they are disciplinary so far as they consist of visible signs which form the central points of the Liturgy, and order of the Church. The same may be said of the Sacramental Rites, such as Orders, Confirmation, and the like. If they are disciplinary in so far as they constitute the outward grades and system of the Church, they are no less doctrinal in their symbolical aspect, which expresses the derived authority of Christ, and the presence of the Holy Ghost.

It would be more strictly true, and philosophical, if we were to say that God has revealed His saving truth to mankind partly by word, and partly by figure; that He has partly spoken and partly shadowed forth the mystery of salvation: for if the words of the Gospel are the words of eternal life through the blood-shedding of Christ, certainly Holy Baptism, and the Holy Eucharist, and Holy Orders, and Confirmation, and the succession of the Apostles, and the polity of the Church, are adumbrations as well as effectual means of spiritual

birth, and food, and strength, and authority, and of the presence of Christ, and of the fatherhood of God. It is the one truth indivisible, now spoken, now shadowed forth, now traced invisibly in the reason, now shown visibly to the eye: doctrine and discipline, faith, and sacraments, the Gospel and the Church are, as it were, one Christ now manifesting Himself, now conveying Himself away from sense.

But with this understanding of the terms the popular division is sufficiently exact for our present purpose. We will therefore proceed to speak of the unity of doctrine and discipline, including under the former the Faith and Sacraments, and under the latter the succession and polity of the Church, of which the sacramental rites are the bands and junctures.

We say, then, that the doctrine and discipline of the whole Church is one.

Of the unity of doctrine, except so far as it is a divine condition to the unity of discipline, I have no intention or need to speak. All Christians agree in holding, both that a right Faith is a necessary condition for Baptism, and for continuance in the communion of the Church; and also that by departing from the unity of the Faith a man departs from the unity of the body of Christ.

That the Apostles in all places taught one and the same doctrine, that the deposit of the Faith has been handed down by Catholic tradition whole and undiminished unto this day, that an inward sub-

mission of mind to this one true objective mystery is necessary to salvation, we all believe. We hold also that churches, as men, may fall from the unity of the body by falling from the unity of the Faith: or, in other words, that heresy severs a member, whether it be a church or a man, from the one visible body. The objective forms, then, in which this unity consists are the doctrine of Faith as revealed by Christ through His Apostles, the Holy Sacraments and Sacramental Rites, namely, Holy Baptism, by which men are first knit into one body, and the Holy Eucharist, by which men are nurtured and kept in the same: the imposition of hands with prayer, which are the essential form and matter in Holy Orders, and in Confirmation: the authoritative benediction of the Church at Holy Matrimony, and all things which the Apostles taught or ordained as matters of immutable obligation.

We are now chiefly concerned with that part of organic unity which consists of discipline.

In the second chapter we saw that the limits of the visible Church are determined by an organised polity—in the last that this polity consists in the authoritative oversight of a divinely appointed ministry, deriving its succession from the Apostles. But hitherto I have abstained from defining its exact form; the real and only important principle lying in the fact that the visible Church in all ages is the same with that which the Apostles founded.

It is evident that mere likeness or correspondence in form cannot constitute this identity. There must be some essential condition which shall make it to be the true lineal descendant and lawful representative of the original body. It is with the Church as with a family or a kingdom. Their identity depends on the direct and lawful devolution of the rights of primogeniture and of prerogative. No assumption by any other body of name, title, and customs without this continuity would make it one with them. A kingdom may undergo many political mutations. It may lapse from a despotism to a democracy, and yet retain its personality. Athens under the kings, decennial and annual archons, was yet one and the same people. It is conceivable that the Church also might retain its identity, even though its polity were indefinitely changed; I say it is conceivable, in so far as the intrinsic nature of any form of polity is concerned, for its polity is to its true identity what the countenance or the figure of a man is to his complex and true identity of person. And therefore they do but miss the point, and perplex the subject, who contend for or against Episcopacy or Presbytery as such. Saving always the basis of identity, God might have been pleased to leave the polity of the Church without express form, to find its own level, and take its own shape, moulding it here and there, from time to time, by the unseen pressure of His overruling hand, as He is wont to do in the kingdoms of the earth. The Church retaining its transmitted

authority might, had He so willed, have put on a succession of new aspects, and conformed itself to the changeable polities of the world. It might have been the ductile element, instead of the fixed mould of human society. But it is a fact in God's work of regenerating the world that He has cast His Church into one definite shape. Like the bodily structure of man, it might have been otherwise arranged, but, without a divine interposition, it now cannot be. There is only one, universal, necessary type.

We will therefore go on to investigate the exact nature of this polity or organisation. And as in the last chapter we assumed for the enunciation of our subject the article of the Catholic Creed, so in this we will assume as a fact the polity of the Catholic Church, and from the existing phenomena trace upwards to the origin of the Church, and thereby ascertain in what the essence of this organic polity consists.

The first fact, then, which strikes the eye at this time in the world, is a visible body of many members professing lineal descent and succession from the Apostles of Christ. We find this body in the extreme East and West, of a self-evident and immemorial antiquity; bearing the stamp and character of ages long gone by; and agreeing universally in the chief and primary elements of its organised system. The Catholic Church of this day is self-evidently one. It has a correlation of parts and a cen-

tral unity which are the properties of an individual being. Throughout its first great subdivision into Patriarchates, and its secondary into Primacies, subject or independent, Metropolitical or Archiepiscopal, and into its several Episcopal jurisdictions—throughout the offices of the Priesthood, and the functions of the Diaconate, there is a series, and order of place and power. From the Patriarch of Rome[1]

[1] The precedence granted to the Church of Rome was given according to the rule observed throughout the whole empire. The seats of the chief civil power were also the sees of the chief spiritual authorities, (see Bingham, B. ix. i. iv.) The first city of the empire conferred on the Church of that city its own precedence. The basis of the greatness of the Roman Church was therefore partly civil and partly ecclesiastical, using that word as defined in the text, and not to express a directly divine or apostolical appointment. Rome was the culminating point of civilization and empire, the political centre, and the focus of all lines of communication and authority. It was the richest and the most numerous Church, and therefore readily became the first in rank. This is what St. Irenæus intends by "propter potiorem principalitatem." Adv. Hær. lib. iii. 3. For this reason, also it would seem, the two great apostles of the circumcision and the uncircumcision bestowed on it so much labour. All these things gave it a natural precedence, and yet we find Tertullian speaking of it only as one of the chief apostolic sees. De Præscr. xxxvi. The attempt to found its precedence on a divine appointment through St. Peter is not a primitive tradition. St. Cyprian, in the third century, is the first that calls it the "Chair of Peter," (Ep. lv.,) and yet in his mouth it was only a title, not a prerogative. It was in the Novatian and Donatist schisms that the succession and origin of the Roman Church, being often forced into argument, began to assume a peculiar aspect. The nature of the controversy drew from St. Cyprian, Optatus, and St. Augustin the kind of appeal and statement on which so much has been, in after ages, built. The whole class of passages have one plain interpretation. They assert the genuine-

to the acolyte there is a subordination of degrees; and in all the parts of the whole body there is an organic unity. And here a distinction must be drawn between what is of ecclesiastical and what is of apostolical origin. The precedence of patriarchal and archiepiscopal sees rests on the canons of the Church, and arose by the force of accidents, separable, before the event, from all sees alike. Patriarchs

ness of the succession derived from St. Peter and St. Paul, not against other genuine successions in the Catholic Church, but against the schismatical rivals. Thence the chair of Peter and the succession of Peter passed into a common title for the Roman succession, and by degrees began to be assigned as the ground of precedence in the Western Church.

When the seat of empire was transferred to Constantinople the fathers in the Council of Constantinople assigned to that Church as the Church of the new Rome a precedence next after the old, proving thereby on what it was originally grounded. The decree is as follows: "Let the Bishop of Constantinople have the place of chief honour after the Bishop of Rome, because Constantinople is New Rome." Canon. 3 Bevereg. Pandectæ, vol. i. 89. And the Council of Chalcedon confirmed and extended these privileges, adding the reason more at large. "The fathers reasonably assigned the chief privileges to the throne (see) of old Rome, because that city had the imperial power: and, moved by the same regard, the hundred and fifty holy Bishops assigned equal privileges to the most holy throne of new Rome, rightly deciding that the city which is honoured with the empire and senate ought to enjoy the same privileges as the elder Rome which had the imperial government," &c. Can. xxviii. Bev. Pand. vol. i. 145. So Concil. in Trullo. Can. 36. The ninth canon of the Council of Chalcedon extends the privileges of Constantinople beyond any that Rome had enjoyed. The Roman jurisdiction has no divine, *i. e.*, direct or apostolical foundation. This may be seen in Mr. Palmer's masterly chapter on the Roman Pontiff, Treatise on the Church, vol. ii. p. 501; in Barrow on the Supremacy; and in Nectarius adversus, Imp. Papæ; or in the work of Nilus, archbishop of Thessalonica, de Primatu Papæ Rom.

and Metropolitans were the bishops either of the greatest or of the oldest sees. Civil precedence is the basis of the Patriarchal, and spiritual maternity of the Metropolitical, authority. But the basis of all apostolical power, whether in Patriarchs, Metropolitans, or archbishops, is the one episcopate, of which indivisible authority all bishops are each one severally and in full partakers. Howsoever complex, therefore, the aspect of the Church Catholic may have become by the lapse and pressure of ages, its complexity may be resolved into the simple form of polity ordained by the Apostles. The threefold orders of bishops, priests, and deacons, which are at this day found in all churches, are the groundwork and essential element of the whole organised system. It is therefore unnecessary for our present purpose to trace the ecclesiastical development of the Church, and to ascertain at what time the several patriarchal and metropolitical privileges were conferred. It is enough to take the apostolical element of the ecclesiastical system, and to trace it upward to its beginning.

Every one, how slightly soever read in the history of the Church, is aware that from the present day upward to the time of Constantine, there has existed a successive ministry in the three orders of bishops, priests, and deacons. At the time of the Council of Nice the episcopate of the whole Church consisted of about 1800 bishops, *i. e.* 1000 in the Eastern, and 800 in the Western Churches.

Our examination, therefore, may be confined to the three centuries between Constantine and the Apostles of Christ.

In tracing out this subject I shall first adduce proofs from uninspired writers, and reserve the proofs of Holy Scripture to the last.

To begin, then, with the writers of the second century, we may adduce a letter of the clergy of the Roman Church to St. Cyprian. This epistle was written on the death of Fabianus, the Bishop of Rome, and during the vacancy of the see. It is inscribed by "the Presbyters and Deacons at Rome to Pope Cyprian." They say, concerning a case of difficulty then before them, "Although a greater necessity to defer this case lies upon us, seeing that, since the death of Fabianus, by reason of the difficult condition of affairs and of the time, we have as yet no bishop appointed to administer these things, and by his authority and counsel to take cognizance of the lapsed brethren. Although in a matter of this great moment we are content with what you have expressed, that the peace of the Church should be first maintained, and then account taken of the lapsed after a conference of the bishops, priests, and deacons, together with the confessors and the faithful laity, &c."[1] We find St. Cyprian giving account of his correspondence with the clergy of Rome to the clergy of his own Church at Carthage, and inscribing his letter "to

[1] Ep. xxxi. ed. Ben.

his brethren the Priests and Deacons."[1] Throughout all his works this threefold order is everywhere recognised. A remarkable incidental proof of this is to be found in his letter to Rogatianus, a bishop, against whom one of his own deacons had behaved contumaciously. He commends him for his gentleness, "seeing that by virtue of the episcopate and authority of the see he had the power to inflict summary punishment"[2] upon a deacon. Against a presbyter the apostle forbids an accusation to be received except before two or three witnesses.[3]

With this distinct use of the titles St. Cyprian says: "Thence (from the mission of the Apostle St. Peter) through the changes of time and succession the ordination of bishops and rule of the Church runs down (to us), that the Church should be built upon the bishops, and every act of the Church be controlled by them as rulers;"[4] whom in another epistle he describes as "a sacerdotal college,"[5] "a single episcopate of many bishops diffused abroad in a numerous and accordant multitude,"[6] in whose unity the Church is united, who have of God an absolute power, but may neither judge nor be judged by a colleague; forasmuch as "all alike wait for the judgment of our Lord Jesus Christ, who alone has power both to advance them to the government of His Church and to judge of their actions."[7]

[1] Ep. xxxii. ed. Ben. [2] Ad Rogat. Ep. lxv. ed. Ben.
[3] 1 Tim. v. 19. [4] Ep. xxvii. ed. Ben.
[5] Ep. lii. [6] Ibid. [7] Concilium Carthag. p. 330.

So also Origen, himself a Presbyter, says, "More is required of me than of a deacon, and more of a deacon than of a layman. But from him to whom is committed the chief power in the Church over us all, still more is required."[1] And in his homilies on St. Matthew, "the bishop, priest, and deacon are a symbol of realities correspondent with their names."[2] So, in another place, he likens the deacons who mal-administered the Church goods to the money-changers in the temple, and bishops and priests who committed the Church of Christ to unworthy men, to the sellers of doves;[3] so, in many places, the three orders are recognised. Also, Tertullian, whose witness runs into the second century, says of baptism, that "the power of giving it is in the chief priest, which is the bishop: thence the Presbyters and deacons have it; and yet they may not give it without the authority of the bishop, for the dignity of the Church, in preserving which peace also is preserved."[4] And speaking of the confusion among the heretical sects, he says, "Advancement is nowhere so easy as in the rebels' camp, where to be is to be meritorious. Therefore to-day one man is bishop, to-morrow another; to-day he is a deacon who to-morrow is a reader;

[1] Orig. Hom. in Jer. 2. quoted by Beveridge, Cod. Can. Eccl. Prim. Vind. &c. c. x. 3.

[2] Orig. in Matth. tom. xiv. 22.

[3] Ibid. tom. xvi. 22. See also Hom. 2. in Cantic. Cantic

[4] De Baptismo, c. 17.

to-day a Presbyter who to-morrow is a layman, for even to laymen they commit sacerdotal functions."[1]

We now come into the second century, in which we may first cite St. Clement of Alexandria, who, in a remarkable passage, sufficiently shows what was the polity of the Church in his times. He says, "The grades of promotion in the Church, that is, of bishops, priests, and deacons, are imitations, I conceive, of the angelic glory."[2] So also Hegesippus, who lived in the early part of the second century, the first writer of ecclesiastical history, tells us that "the Corinthian Church continued in the right faith until the episcopate of Primus:"[3] also, speaking of Jerusalem, he says, "After the martyrdom of James the Just, next after his uncle, Symeon, the son of Cleopas, was made bishop;" and immediately after, "Thebuthis, because he was not made bishop, began secretly to corrupt (the Church)."[4] In this way he always distinguishes the episcopate from the other orders. As Polycrates, Bishop of Ephesus, also says, "Polycarp, who was Bishop of Smyrna, and a martyr, and Thraseas, Bishop of Eumenia, and a martyr; why should I speak of Sagaris, who was also bishop and martyr?" He calls himself also bishop, as Ignatius does: "Seven of my kindred," he says, "were bishops, and I the eighth."[5]

[1] De præscr. Hæret. c. xli. [2] Strom. vi. c. 13. p. 793. Potter.
[3] Biblioth. Vet. Patrum. Gallandii, tom. ii. 64; also Euseb. Eccl. Hist. lib. iv. c. xxii. [4] Ibid. 65. [5] Ibid. 161.

We may next cite St. Irenæus, who was of the same age with Polycarp, and his disciple. Speaking of St. Paul's journey through Asia Minor,[1] he says, "The bishops and presbyters who came from Ephesus and the other neighbouring cities, being called together at Miletus, because he was hastening to keep the Pentecost at Jerusalem,"[2] he charged them and foretold what should befall him. In another place he writes, "Every one who desires to see the truth may readily perceive the tradition of the Apostles, which is manifested in all the Church; and we are able to enumerate those who were ordained bishops in the Churches by the Apostles, and their successors even to our day."[3] "But since it would be too long a work in such a book as this to enumerate the successions of all the Churches, we confound all (heretics) . . . . . by exhibiting the tradition of the great, and most ancient, and well-known Church, which by the two glorious Apostles, Peter and Paul, was founded and established at Rome, the tradition which it has from the Apostles, and the faith which is declared to all men, and has come down by the succession of bishops to us,"[4] &c. And immediately after, "The blessed Apostles, therefore, having founded and instructed the Church, committed the office of the episcopate to Linus. Of this Linus St. Paul makes mention in his Epistle to Timothy. His successor was Anacletus. After him, in the third place from

[1] Acts xx. 17. [2] S. Iren. lib. iii. xiv. 2.
[3] Ibid. lib. iii. 3. [4] Ibid. s. 2.

the Apostles, Clement obtained the episcopate, who had both seen the blessed Apostles and had conversed with them."[1] "To this Clement succeeded Evaristus, and to Evaristus Alexander; and then the sixth from the Apostles, Sixtus, was appointed; and after him Telesphorus, who suffered martyrdom in a glorious manner; and then Hyginus, afterwards Pius, after whom Anicetus. After Soter had succeeded to Anicetus, Eleutherius, who now, the twelfth from the Apostles, holds the episcopate."[2] We know from Eusebius that, in the episcopate of Eleutherius, Florinus was deposed from the order of Presbyters in the Roman Church for heresy.[3] And in the time of Cornelius, who was the eighth bishop after Eleutherius, the Presbyters in Rome were forty-four in number.[4]

There is another document of the same age which will exhibit the distinction of these offices. In the letter of the Christians at Lyons, addressed to the Churches of Asia and Phrygia, they speak of their Bishop as "the blessed Pothinus, to whom was intrusted the office of the episcopate in Lyons."[5] Speaking of Irenæus, in a letter to Eleutherius, they say, "For if we conceived that rank conferred merit upon any, we would earnestly commend him to you as a Presbyter of the Church, in which order he is." In this they observe the distinction of the two orders with great exactness;

[1] S. Iren. lib. iii. c. 3. s. 3. [2] Ibid.
[3] Hist. Eccl. lib. v. 15.
[4] Ibid. lib. vi. 43. [5] Ibid. lib. v. 1.

as also in all parts of the epistle. For Eleutherius, who was a bishop, they call "Father," Irenæus only "brother," and "colleague," and "fellow," with themselves. Eusebius, who preserves these passages of their letters, narrates the history, and tells us, "These same martyrs commended Irenæus, who was then a Presbyter in the diocese of Lyons, to the abovementioned Bishop of Rome."[1] And so St. Jerome writes: "Irenæus, Presbyter to Pothinus, the bishop who then ruled the Church of Lyons in Gaul, was sent as legate by the martyrs of that place to Rome, concerning certain ecclesiastical questions, and exhibited to Eleutherius, the bishop, honourable letters concerning himself. Afterwards, when Pothinus, nearly at the age of ninety, was crowned with martyrdom for Christ, he was advanced to his place."[2]

In the very ancient writings called the Acts of St. Ignatius we read that he, "disbarking from the ship with great joy, hastened to see St. Polycarp, the bishop, who had been a fellow-hearer (of St. John) with himself." And a little after: "The cities and Churches of Asia honoured the saint through their bishops, priests, and deacons."[3] Also in the Acts of St. Polycarp, who, as Irenæus, his disciple, says, was ordained Bishop of Smyrna by the Apostles, he is called "Polycarp, the martyr in our times, much to be admired, the Apostolic and

[1] Euseb. Eccl. Hist. lib. v. 4.
[2] S. Hieron. Catalog. Script. Eccl. tom. iv. 113. ed. Ben.
[3] Martyrium S. Ignat. s. 3. Coteler. Patr. Apost. tom. ii. 159.

Prophetic Doctor, and Bishop of the Catholic Church in Smyrna." [1]

We have come now to the first century and times of the Apostles, in which lived those writers who by pre-eminence are called the Apostolic Fathers, as having conversed with the Apostles themselves.

St. Hermas evidently refers to the threefold orders where he speaks of "the Apostles, and *bishops*, and *doctors*, and *ministers*, who through the mercy of God have come in and *governed*, and *taught*, and *ministered* holily and modestly to the elect of God." [2]

St. Clement, also writing to the Corinthians, draws a parallel between the Jewish and Christian hierarchy, and adds: "To the high priest are given his peculiar functions; and to the priests their own place is appointed; and on the Levites their proper ministry is imposed: the layman is obliged by the rules of the laity. Let each of you, brethren, in his own order, give God thanks with a good conscience, not transgressing the defined rule of his ministry." [3] As a comment on this passage may be quoted the words of Jerome: "And that we may know the apostolical traditions to be taken from the Old Testament, what Aaron, and his sons, and the Levites were in the temple, that bishops, priests, and deacons have claim to be in the Church." [4]

There remains now only St. Ignatius, from whom,

[1] Martyrium S. Polycarpi. s. 16. ibid. p. 201.
[2] S. Hermæ Pastor. Vis. iii. 5.
[3] S. Clem. 1 Ep. ad Cor. 40. comp. 42.
[4] Ad Evangelum, tom. iv. 803.

in the second chapter, we have already quoted enough. The following passage or two will suffice to close up this series. In his epistle to the Magnesians, after commending Damas, the bishop, Bassa and Apollonius, presbyters, and Sotion, a deacon, he goes on to say, "The bishop sits the first in order, as in the place of God, and the presbyters as the synod of Apostles, and the deacons, to me most dear, to whom is intrusted the ministry of Jesus Christ." [1] And to the Smyrneans, "Let all give heed to the bishop as Jesus Christ to the Father, and to the Presbytery, as to the Apostles; and reverence the deacons as the commandment of God." [2] And "There is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one cup for the union of His blood, one altar, as one bishop, with the presbyters and deacons, my fellow-servants." [3]

Although the testimonies here adduced are from the writings of uninspired men, there are yet two points worthy of much regard. The first is their absolute agreement; one and all describing, by three several and distinct names, the three several and distinct orders of bishop, priest, and deacon, as the threefold offices of the one apostolical ministry. The next, that the series of accordant witnesses has been traced up to the very lifetime of the Apostles of Christ. We may therefore conclude that from the latter part of the apostolic age both the names and offices were distinct and appropriate.

[1] Ad Magnes. 6. [2] Ad Smyrn. 8. [3] Ad Philad. 4.

We will now go on to ascertain whether the same distinction is to be found in the documents of the inspired writers.

That the present inquiry may be made as clear and definite as possible, I will here state beforehand the conclusion in which it will terminate. There is abundant evidence to show that if in the apostolic writings the *names* be interchanged among the three orders, yet the *offices* are never confounded.

The only point of difference, therefore, between the apostolic and post-apostolic age would seem to be, that the names had then become technical and restricted by second intention to the several offices.

But before I bring any passages from the New Testament to show the possible confusion of these names, I must beg the reader's most careful attention to the following passage from the works of a writer, of whom it has been truly said, that even his lightest fragments are as the filings of gold. "It does not yet appear that the names bishop and presbyter in the apostolic writings are synonymous, where the offices of the Church are spoken of. Certainly, the arguments which have been hitherto adduced do not necessarily compel us to believe it; and it is more probable that such a common use of these words in the apostolic writings is not to be admitted. Because, in the first place, if we examine the origin of this interpretation, we shall find the first who brought it forward to confirm his opinion was Aerius the heretic, whose opinion was no sooner published than it was exploded by St

Epiphanius. Secondly, those Catholics who afterwards embraced the same interpretation for another purpose, whether you take the ancients or the moderns, have never been able to agree in explaining it. If all the ways which can be contrived or fancied to explain this community of the two names should be exhibited, you will hardly find two which nobody has embraced, certainly not one in which two, or perhaps three, have agreed, excepting those who professedly and wholly transcribe from others. Whosoever conceives the idea of the community of these two names must necessarily suppose that there existed in the Churches, first founded by the care and authority of the Apostles, either one only order, or two; and, indeed, they who contend for this community of names are divided into various opinions concerning the number of orders existing at that time. All acknowledge that, a short time after the books of the New Testament were written, two orders or grades, distinct both in office and dignity, obtained, whether by right or wrong, in the Church; to the superior of which the name of bishop, to the inferior of presbyter, was attached. They who think that only one of these existed while the books of the New Testament were being written, and that the other was afterwards added, acknowledge either the inferior order, above which the superior was afterwards placed, or the superior, to which the inferior was afterwards supplied. Hence arise two ways of explaining the community of the names—one, that the names of bishop and

presbyter were indiscriminately given to the priests of one order, who were called priests of the inferior order, or presbyters, after the superior order was introduced and placed over them; which opinion, they say, is that of St. Jerome, and I do not contest it: the other, that the same names were indiscriminately given to the priests of one order, who were called priests of the superior order or bishops, after the inferior order was introduced and placed under them; which opinion Hammond, than whom no one has handled the subject more accurately, defends as the most likely. They who do not doubt that in the Apostles' times, and by their institution, there were two orders distinct both in office and dignity, are divided into more opinions concerning the community of the names. Of which opinions the first was, that at that time either name was common to either order; so that they who were advanced to the superior order were called sometimes bishops and sometimes presbyters; and in like manner they that were ordained to the inferior grade were named sometimes presbyters and sometimes bishops, which was the opinion of Chrysostom and his followers. But the second opinion was, that the name bishop and presbyter was given indifferently and indiscriminately to the priests of the inferior order; but neither of them to those of the first order, or the bishops, because at that time the priests of the first order were called Apostles, which was the opinion of Theodoret. Besides these, two other conjectures may be formed,

i. e. that the priests of the superior order were sometimes called bishops and sometimes presbyters, but those of the inferior—presbyters only, which Hammond admits as likely; or that the priests of the inferior order were sometimes called presbyters and sometimes bishops, but those of the superior—bishops only, which no one has embraced. Since there is so great dissension among all who think they have discovered the community of these names in Scripture, and their various opinions, which are almost as many as there are men, can in no way be reconciled, it is rendered still more probable that such a community of names is not indeed to be found in Scripture at all." [1]

We may now shortly state the case as it relates to the usage of these names in Holy Scripture; always remembering that no argument will be drawn from it. In the New Testament the words ἐπίσκοπος, πρεσβύτερος, and διάκονος, bishop, priest, and deacon, or overseer, elder, and minister, with their cognates, ἐπισκοπή, πρεσβυτέριον, and διακόνια, episcopate, presbytery, diaconate or oversight, eldership, and ministry, are used in various ways, which may, however, be reduced to two—general and ecclesiastical.

Of the general use the following will be sufficient examples.

Our Lord says of Jerusalem that she knew not the time of her visitation: τὸν καιρὸν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς. [2]

[1] Bishop Pearson's Vindiciæ Ignatianæ, cap. xiii. CotelerPat. Apost. ii. 427.

[2] St. Luke xix. 44. See also 1 St. Pet. ii. 12.

We read in St. Paul's Epistle to the Hebrews that, "through faith, the elders (*οἱ πρεσβύτεροι*)[1] obtained a good report." In the parable of the wedding garment the king commands the servants (*τοῖς διακόνοις*[2]) to bind the intruder and cast him forth. Our Lord says to His disciples, "Whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister" (*διάκονος*)[3]. And of Martha we read that she "was cumbered about much serving" (*διακονίαν*).[4]

This general sense of the words by restriction became ecclesiastical.

And first of the Jewish Church. The words *ἐπίσκοπος* and *ἐπισκοπή* do not occur in the New Testament as applied to the Church of the Jews. But the word bishopric (*ἐπισκοπή*) is quoted from the 109th Psalm by St. Peter — "And his bishopric let another take" (*καὶ τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν αὐτοῦ λάβοι ἕτερος*)[5]. In the Septuagint the word *ἐπίσκοπος* is of frequent occurrence. In Numbers xxxi. 14, the captain of the host is *ἐπίσκοπος τῆς δυνάμεως*. In Chron. xxxiv. 12, 17, the chief among the workmen. In Neh. xi. 9, 14, the ruler or prince of the city; and ch. v. 10, the chief of the priests: in verse 15 the chief of the Levites is called *ἐπίσκοπος*. Eleazar the son of Aaron (who in Numbers iii. 32 is called *ἀρχόντων*

[1] Heb. xi. 2. [2] St. Matth. xxii. 13. [3] Ibid. xx. 26. [4] St. Luke x. 40.

[5] Ps. cix. 8. For what follows, see Hammond's note on Acts i. 20.

τῶν Λευϊτῶν ἄρχων, the ruler of the rulers of the Levites), in Numbers iv. 16 is called ἐπίσκοπος Ἐλεάζαρ[1]. In 2 Kings xi. 18, he that was set over the house of the Lord is called ἐπίσκοπος ἐπὶ τὸν δικον κυρίου. In all these several uses the idea of precedence and ruling power is expressed.

In a multitude of places throughout the New Testament the word "elder" or "presbyter" signifies a member of the sanhedrim or council of the Jews, and πρεσβυτέριον, the council itself. In this all nations have alike concurred, as the γέροντες and γερουσία in the Greek states, and "Senatus" among the Latins. In this sense we read of "the tradition of the elders,"[2] the "elders and chief priests,"[3] the "council of the people" (πρεσβυτέριον τοῦ λαοῦ),[4] the "estate of the elders."[5] In all which passages it is plain that the words signify a collective, deliberative, and ruling body, subject to the chief priests.[6]

The words "deacon" and "diaconate" nowhere occur in the New Testament as applied to the Jewish Church.

[1] Isai. lx. 17. LXX. καὶ δώσω τοὺς ἄρχοντάς σου ἐν ἐ ρήνῃ, καὶ τοὺς ἐπισκόπους σου ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ. Quoted thus by St. Clement, 1 Ep. ad Cor. c. 42:—καὶ τοῦτο (*i. e.*, the institution of bishops and deacons by the Apostles) οὐ καινῶς ἐκ· γὰρ δὴ πολλῶν χρόνων ἐγέγραπτο περὶ ἐπισκόπων καὶ διακόνων. Οὕτως γάρ που λέγει ἡ γραφή· "καταστήσω τοὺς ἐπισκόπους αὐτῶν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, καὶ τοὺς διακόνους αὐτῶν ἐν πίστει."

[2] St. Matth. xv. 2.
[3] St. Mark viii. 31.
[4] St. Luke xxii. 66.
[5] Acts xxii. 6.
[6] Hammond's Paraphr. on New Test., note on Acts xi. 26.

I now come to the use of these words as applied to the Church of Christ.

We have already seen that the word "bishopric" (ἐπισκοπὴ) is applied by St. Luke to the Apostolate of Judas. We find it again used by St. Paul in writing to Timothy, as expressing the episcopate or oversight (whether singly or conjointly must be determined by other evidence) of a particular church.[1] St. Paul charges the presbyters or elders (τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους τῆς ἐκκλησίας)[2] who met him at Miletus, to take heed to the flock over which the Holy Ghost had made them overseers or bishops (ἐπισκόπους).[3] He also salutes the Philippian Church "with the bishops and deacons."[4] He tells Titus, a bishop should be blameless.[5] Here we find the Milesian presbyters addressed as bishops, and a salutation omitting the presbytery sent to only two orders in the Church at Philippi. Also, in the Epistle to Timothy, an immediate transition is made from the office of a bishop to that of a deacon.[6]

So again we find with the word "presbyter" or "elder." We read of "the apostles and elders,"[7] "the elders and brethren,"[8] "the elders of the church;"[9] in all which places "presbyters" will equally stand. St. James speaks of "the elders of the church"[10] for the ministry generally. St. Peter exhorts the elders or presbyters to feed the flock of God.[11]

[1] 1 Tim. iii. 1. [2] Acts xx. 17. [3] Ibid. 28.
[4] Phil. i. 1. [5] Tit. i. 7. [6] 1 Tim. iii. 1, 8.
[7] Acts xv. 2, 4, 6. [8] Ibid. 23. [9] xx. 17.
[10] St. Jam. v. 14. [11] 1 St. Pet. v. 1, 2.

St. Paul charges Timothy to cherish the gift that was given to him by "the laying on of the hands of the presbytery."[1]

Now in all this there is not so much as a word of bishop or bishopric.

And to make this apparent ambiguity greater, we find the Apostles nowhere call themselves bishops. We find St. Peter and St. John calling themselves presbyters.[2] St. Paul calls Tychicus a deacon,[3] and Timothy a deacon,[4] and himself a deacon,[5] and all the Apostles deacons twice over;[6] and, as if to banish from our minds the whole question of names, he calls Apollos an apostle,[7] and Epaphroditus an apostle.[8]

Certainly, if the interchange of names be at all a refutative argument, then there did not exist, as a distinct office, Deacon, Presbyter, Bishop, or Apostle. They who contend that the names are thus common and indiscriminate must abide the full issue of their principle. To say that a word is used here in a wider, and there in a restricted sense —that in one place the Apostle would magnify the office of his fellow-workers—and in another depress his own dignity, is but to admit a principle of sound criticism, by which, if applied at all, they also must consistently and fairly abide. The issue would not be doubtful, though very adverse to their pur-

[1] 1 Tim. iv. 14. [2] 1 St. Peter v. 1; 1 St. John ii. 1; iii. 1.
[3] Eph. vi. 21. [4] 1 Tim. iv. 6. [5] Eph. iii. 7.
[6] 1 Cor. iv. 1; 2 Cor. iii. 6.
[7] 1 Cor. iv. 6, conf. 9. Vid. Suic. Thesaur. in voc. *ἀπόστολος*.
[8] Philip. ii. 25: *συστρατιώτην μου ὑμῶν δὲ ἀπόστολον*.

pose in adopting it. Now it is not to be denied that the seeming laxity with which these names are used in the apostolic writings presents at first sight no small difficulty. But it is equally certain that the way to make the difficulty a thousand-fold greater is to attempt a verbal proof from the several *names* without investigating the *facts* of the case. We should not only be committing ourselves to a mistaken view of the matter from which the proof is to be derived, but also to a false principle on which the investigation is to be conducted. "To contend about the names of bishops or presbyters is nothing more than walking upon air; and so to propound the dispute that there never can be an end of disputing:"[1] the real question being whether the Apostles, before they departed this life, committed the ultimate power of ruling the Church, and ordaining others, to any one person in each church, or to many, that is, according to the modern formula, whether to a bishop, or to a body of presbyters?[2] When we have come to a conclusion on this point, we shall find that the names in the apostolic writings will for the most part fall into their own places. But, after all, whether we succeed or no in adjusting the use of these several *titles*, the facts of history will prove that the *offices* were distinct; and on this alone we rest.

[1] "De nominibus enim Episcoporum et Presbyterorum contendere nihil aliud est quam ἀεροβατεῖν, et disputationem ita instituere, ut nullus sit disputandi finis." Bishop Beveridge, in Cod. Com., &c., lib. ii. c. xi. 13.

[2] Ibid.

We must remember, then, that the point is not to be decided by quoting the first acts of the apostles, immediately after our Lord's ascension, when they were on the threshold of their ministry.[1] He that searches for dogmatic proofs (for the co-optation of Matthias is a practical one) of the apostolical succession at the time the Apostles were only themselves succeeding to the sole apostolate[2] of our Lord, must have a mind strangely exacting, or eccentric in its reasoning process: or he that looks to find from the beginning of the Gospel an entire hierarchy, with all its supplements and complements of order and office, must have a mind as strangely unskilled in the analogies of God's works. The notion that the Church was perfected in all its organic parts, *uno apostolorum afflatu*, by the first breath of St. Peter and the Apostles, has no foundation in the testimony either of inspired or uninspired history. On the contrary, not only the analogy of all God's inanimate and animate works, but also His earlier dispensations, would lead us beforehand to look for what in Holy Scripture we find.[3] We may take therefore the beginning of the Book of the Acts of the Apostles and the beginning of the Book of the Revelation of St. John as the two extreme points of the Apostolic ministry as recorded by inspired men. Between these two extremes we may trace the growth and development of the Church; and how, according to

[1] Bishop Beveridge, in Cod. Com., &c., lib. ii. c. xi. 13.

[2] "As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you."—St. John, xx. 21.

[3] S. Epiph. adv. Hær. lib. iii. tom. i. v.

its necessities, some organic provision to maintain its health and energy was supplied. The point to be ascertained is not so much what the Apostles did when they began to found the Church, as how they left it when they had finished the work which their Lord had given them to do.

And first we have the witness of Scripture that the number of twelve, which had been determined by the Lord Himself for the fellowship of His Apostles, was carefully and designedly kept up, by the co-optation of Matthias into the place of Judas.

The twelve, with the rest of the Disciples, in all one hundred and twenty, were the whole Church of Christ.

The seventy disciples, who, as the Evangelists record, had been chosen and sent forth by our Lord, do not appear again as a distinct body in the apostolic writings: but that they continued in the fellowship of the Apostles, and that their original commission, which, so far as we read, had never been revoked by our Lord, was not rescinded by His Apostles, no one can doubt.

We then read of the selection and ordination of seven men to a subordinate and secular office. The seven deacons, as we are wont to call them, were set apart to a function which is placed in diametrical contradistinction from the spiritual office of the Apostles. They were ordained to serve tables, that the Apostles, being exempt from that secular burden, might without distraction give themselves to prayer, and to the ministry of the word. Thus far the Diaconate

was a simply secular office; and yet we find it imposed upon men, of whom two, Stephen and Philip, immediately appear preaching and baptizing in the name of Christ. Either, then, as some think, they were already of the number of the seventy whom our Lord had commissioned to preach; or the laying on of the hands of the Apostles did confer a restricted spiritual office, to which the secular function, though it was the end for which they were required, was but incidental. I say a restricted office, because, after that Philip had preached and baptized at Samaria, the Apostles Peter and John were sent thither to lay hands upon those that had received Philip's baptism.[1] This is a fact of much importance, inasmuch as it proves, beyond controversy, that the Apostles, out of the plenitude of their ghostly authority, communicated a portion of their functions, and constituted an inferior order with a restricted power, which was a development or offshoot of their own commission. The date of this transaction was about the year A.D. 37, and before the Apostles left Jerusalem.[2] We then read of the conversion of St. Paul, of his going up to Jerusalem, of the vision of St. Peter at Joppa, of the admission of the Gentiles in the person of Cornelius: then of St. Peter's going to justify himself to the Apostles and brethren in Jerusalem: then of the spread of the Gospel in Phœnice, Cyprus, and Antioch, to which place Barnabas was sent from Jerusalem about the year A.D. 43, that is six years, or more, after the ordina-

[1] Acts viii. 14, 17. [2] Ibid. viii. 1.

tion of the Deacons. Up to this time we have heard of none but the Apostles and Deacons, and now for the first time we read of Presbyters. The Christians of Antioch made a gathering for the relief of the brethren in Judæa, against the famine which Agabus foretold, and sent "it to the elders (*πρὸς τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους*) by the hands of Barnabas and Saul."

Before I make any remark upon this newly emergent feature in the primitive system, I must first observe that hitherto, that is, for the space of at least ten years, we know from Scripture of no orders in the Church at Jerusalem but Apostles and Deacons. It would seem that this was the polity which was first required, and therefore first developed, in the beginnings of a Church; and this seems to hold good also at Philippi: by which supposition we might not improbably solve the omission of Presbyters in St. Paul's salutation of that Church; and likewise the apparent omission in his instructions to Timothy.[1]

[1] So St. Clement of Rome: "Christ was sent from God, and the Apostles from Christ, and they went forth preaching the Gospel . . . . as they preached in the countries and cities they constituted their first fruits, after approving them by the Spirit, as Bishops and Deacons of those that should believe." Ep. i. ad Cor. 42. As also St. Cyprian: "Deacons ought to remember that the Apostles, that is, Bishops and Rulers, the Lord himself chose out; but that the Deacons, after the ascension of the Lord into heaven, the Apostles instituted, to be ministers of their Episcopate, and of the Church." Ep. ad Rogat. lxv. ed. Ben. To the same effect St. Epiphanius says, that the Apostles developed the orders gradually, according to the state of each several Church: in some places ordaining Presbyters and Deacons, reserving the

I say, the apparent omission in the Epistle to Timothy; for Presbyters are not really omitted, but twice most distinctly and expressly spoken of.[1] Moreover, if real omissions were conclusive proofs, there would seem to have been no Deacons in the churches of Crete; for, in the Epistle to Titus, St. Paul describes only the character and qualifications necessary for Presbyters or Bishops.[2] But this would prove too much. After all, nothing can be proved from omissions, but the gradual development of the several Churches, which the facts of history also confirm.

We have next to consider the origin and the functions of Presbyters, as they now for the first time appear in the Church of Jerusalem.

It is remarkable that we have no record of the institution of these Presbyters. We find them existing as a body in the Church of Jerusalem, but there is not a trace of their first rise. It would be well if they who rest so much on names would observe this fact.

Episcopate; in others, a Bishop and Deacons, reserving the Presbyterate: for instance, he says, in explaining the use of the names in St. Paul's Epistles, "Where there was none fit or worthy to be a Bishop, the place remained void without any: when need required, and there were those that were fit for it, Bishops were constituted; but while there was no great multitude of Christians, there were found none among them to be constituted Presbyter, and they contented themselves with a Bishop alone: yet without a Deacon it was impossible for a Bishop to be, and therefore the Apostle took care that the Bishop should have his Deacons to minister to him." S. Epiphan. lib. iii. t. 1. See also s. v.

[1] 1 Tim. v. 7, 8, 9. [2] Tit. i. 7.

That the office of Presbyter was not the same as that of the Deacons is confessed on all hands.

That it was not the same as that of the Apostles is equally plain, for we find the Apostles and Presbyters carefully distinguished, as in the following passages. In the discussions which arose about circumcision, Paul and Barnabas went up "to Jerusalem unto the Apostles and Presbyters;"[1] "they were received of the Church and of the Apostles and Presbyters."[2] "The Apostles and Presbyters came together for to consider of this matter."[3] "Then pleased it the Apostles and Presbyters and the whole Church to send chosen men."[4] "And they wrote letters by them after this manner: The Apostles, Presbyters, and Brethren send greeting."[5] "And as they went through the cities they delivered them the decrees for to keep, that were ordained of the Apostles and Presbyters which were at Jerusalem."[6] Now it is here to be observed that, be the Presbyters what they may, they are distinguished from the Apostles and named after them in every case. I know of no instance in which this precedence is not observed. It must also be remarked that at this same time one of the Apostles stood in a very conspicuous and peculiar relation to the Presbyters at Jerusalem. It is true that Scripture does not exactly define it; but there are sufficient indications of a personal and peculiar authority vested in St. James. When St. Peter was delivered out of prison

[1] Acts xv. 2. [2] Ibid. 4. [3] Ibid. 6. [4] Ibid. 22.
[5] Ibid. 23. [6] Ibid. xvi. 4.

by the angel, his first care, as soon as he entered the house of Mary, was to send and make known his safety "to James and to the brethren."[1] At St. Paul's first visit to Jerusalem after his conversion we find James, Cephas, and John mentioned, James being named first.[2] When, at the council at Jerusalem, St. Peter had stated his opinion on the question of circumcision, it was James that summed up the discussion, and gave the definitive sentence on which the council proceeded to act.[3] And again at St. Paul's last visit to Jerusalem, we read he "went in unto James, and all the Presbyters were present."[4] And he saluted them and gave an account of his ministry among the Gentiles. No one can doubt that this account of St. Paul's ministry was rendered to the Church of Jerusalem, then and there duly assembled, and James is named at the head of it. As I have strictly confined myself to Holy Scripture in this part of the present chapter, I forbear to introduce into the text collateral proofs of the historical fact that St. James was Bishop of that Church.[5]

[1] Acts xii. 17. [2] Gal. i. 19, and ii. 9.
[3] Gal. xv. 13. [4] Ibid. xxi. 18.

[5] "At Acts xii. 17, there is such a distinct and special mention of James, the brother of our Lord, as justifies us in supposing that he already possessed a specific rank in the Church of Jerusalem; and yet it is the first of the kind, and it comes in, as we see, at the Passover of U.C. 796 (A.D. 42), after the conversion of Cornelius. It is an unquestionable fact that this James was Bishop of Jerusalem. And if he had been appointed subsequently to the conversion of Cornelius, U.C. 794, it would do much to confirm the tradition above alluded to, that for twelve years the Apostles were not to leave Jerusalem; and, consequently, that at the end of twelve they were. While they were all in Jerusalem, and all

These indications of Scripture are enough for my present purpose, which is to show that in every case the Apostles are referred to as distinct from and superior to Presbyters, and that St. James had a visible precedence in rank and office. There is only one more mention of Presbyters in the Book of Acts. In the fourteenth chapter we read of St. Paul's first preaching among the Gentiles of Asia. This was about the year A.D. 44. In the 23rd verse we read that Paul and Barnabas "ordained them Presbyters in every city."[1] Here we have the first and only record of such an ordination in the Book of Acts. Now, of whatsoever rank and power these were, it is manifest they stood in the same relation to the Apostles Paul and Barnabas that the Presbyters of Jerusalem stood in to the rest of the Apostles, and to James the Just. They

actively engaged on the spot, it is reasonable to presume they would all be at the head of the Church alike; and so, from Acts vi. 2; viii. 1—14; ix. 27, 32; xi. 1, before this point of time in U.C. 796, they are manifestly seen to be. But when they were beginning to prepare for the business of preaching the Gospel on a more enlarged scale than before, and in other parts of the world besides Judæa, the necessity of appointing some one to reside with, and to preside over the mother Church permanently, would be evident even to ordinary wisdom and prudence: in which case (if the choice were not dictated by the Holy Ghost himself), none was so likely to be selected for the government of a Church, which consisted exclusively of the brethren of Christ according to the flesh, as James, the brother of Christ according to the flesh." Greswell's Harmony of the Gospels, vol. ii. 58. The historical proofs are given in full by Bishop Taylor in his Episcopacy Asserted, &c., sect. xiii.; by Cave, in the history of St. James the Less, contained in his Lives of the Apostles; and by Hammond, Letter of Resolution to Six Queries, Works, vol. i. p. 511.

[1] Acts xiv. 32.

were of the same order with those of whom we read that they were convened by St. Paul to Miletus, *i. e.* "the Presbyters of the Church"[1] of Ephesus. It seems highly probable, according to the view already advanced on the authority of St. Epiphanius,[2] that in these Churches there were none mature enough in the faith for the charge of the Episcopate. They were necessarily new converts, or "novices;" and for that reason, by the judgment of St. Paul, unfit for the office of a Bishop.[3] The Apostles therefore ordained Presbyters, or teachers, reserving to themselves the government of the Churches, which, as we expressly read in the Book of Acts, St. Paul exercised in his apostolic journeys throughout Asia.[4] Of Presbyters we do not once read in any of the apostolic epistles until we come to the First to Timothy. In the absence of all other lights from Holy Scripture, it is reasonable to conclude that these Presbyters were an order constituted by the Apostles, when the multitude of Christians increased, to aid them in the spiritual functions of the Apostolate, as the Deacons were first constituted, when "the number of the disciples was multiplied,"[5] to relieve them of the secular office of distributing the alms of the Church. At first they needed assistants only in the lower, afterwards also in the higher functions; and what was true in any church, as at Jerusalem, by reason of the multitude of Christians, was true

[1] Acts xx. 17. [2] See p. 122, and note. [3] 1 Tim. iii. 6.
[4] Acts xv. 36. [5] Acts vi. 1.

also in other churches by reason of the absence of the Apostles. In the journeys of St. Paul he must needs leave each several church as he founded it, and pass on to other cities. Therefore he left men charged with spiritual functions, reserving to himself the oversight.

But still there remains this difficulty: St. Paul calls the Presbyters who met him at Miletus "Bishops." And in his Epistle to Titus it would seem as if the two names were indiscriminately used, and the two apparent offices were one and the same.[1] Let us make the most of the difficulty. The Bishops and Deacons at Philippi might then be only Presbyters and Deacons, and St. Paul's Epistle to Timothy would seem to show that these were the only two orders existing at that time. This, I believe, is the full force of which the objection is capable. Now let it be observed that the controversy turns upon these two passages. Let them, for a moment, be supposed not to exist, and the others may be explained on the principle stated by St. Epiphanius. We are therefore testing the expressions, not of many passages, but of two only: no others have the same *verbal* ambiguity; and in these two, it would certainly seem that St. Paul calls the same persons at one time Presbyters, and at another Bishops.

It may not be amiss to state that it has been thought, by some well versed in the records of the Church, that both the Presbyters of Jerusalem

[1] Titus i. 5—7.

before spoken of, and the Presbyters of Ephesus, were truly Bishops gathered from the neighbouring churches. This view is rendered not unlikely by the passage of Irenæus already quoted, in which he says "the Bishops and Presbyters from Ephesus, and the other neighbouring cities, were convened" by St. Paul.

It may also be supposed that, among them, there might be Bishops; or it may be conceived that St. Paul calls them Bishops, because in his absence they had the oversight of the flock which he had gathered. They were his representatives.

We may now examine how they meet the difficulty who, while they contend for the distinction of *orders*, admit the community of names; and first we may cite St. Chrysostom, who on the salutation of the Philippian Church[1] has this comment:— "What is this? Were there many Bishops of one city? By no means. But he thus calls the Presbyters. For up to that time they partook of the names in common, and the Bishop himself was called a Deacon."[2] Again: "Of old the Presbyters were called 'Bishops,' and the Bishops 'Presbyters' and 'Deacons' of Christ; whence many Bishops even now write to their 'fellow-presbyter' and 'fellow-deacon.' But afterwards the proper name was distributed to each, and the one called 'Bishop,' the other 'Presbyter.'" And on the First Epistle to Timothy he says, "Discoursing of Bishops, and

[1] Philip. i. 1. [2] S. Chrysost. in loc.

sketching their character, and saying what things a Bishop should have, and from what he should abstain, and having dismissed the order of Presbyters, he (St. Paul) passes on at a leap to the Deacons. Why? Because the difference between them and Bishops is not much, forasmuch as they also are possessed of the authority to teach, and to rule the Church. And what he said of Bishops applies also to them; for they exceed them by the power of ordaining only, and in this alone they have more authority than the Presbyters."[1]

Theodoret, whose commentary represents that of St. Chrysostom, says on the same passage to the Philippians: "He called the blessed Epaphroditus their 'Apostle' in this same epistle, thereby plainly shewing that he had the functions of the Episcopate committed to him as he had the title of Apostle." So in verse 25 of chapter ii.: "He called him their Apostle, as having the charge of them committed to him; so that it is evident that they, who in the opening of the Epistle were called Bishops, ministered under him, that is, discharging the office of Presbyter." And this he explains more fully in his commentary on 1 Tim. iii.: "They were wont of old to call the same persons Presbyters and Bishops. But those that are now called Bishops they named Apostles. But in process of time they gave up the name of the Apostleship to those that were in a strict sense Apostles; and applied the

[1] In 1 Epist. ad Tim. cap. iii. Hom. xi.

title of the Episcopate to those that were of old called Apostles. Thus Epaphroditus was Apostle of the Philippians; thus Titus was Apostle of the Cretans, and Timothy of the Asiatics. Thus the Apostles and Presbyters who were at Jerusalem wrote to those in Antioch." So the author of the Commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul, which has been ascribed to St. Jerome,[1] on the third chapter of the First Epistle to Timothy, says, "It is a question why he makes no mention of Presbyters, but comprehends them in the name of Bishops. Because the second order is all but one," *i. e.* with the first. Now it must be remarked that both these writers, at one and the same time, contend for the community of the *names* and the distinction of the *orders* even in the Apostles' times: so that, if the view of Bishop Pearson, founded on the testimony of St. Epiphanius and St. Irenæus, be at all unsettled by the weight of their testimony, our conviction of the main point for which we are seeking, namely, the distinctness of the Episcopate, must be in the same measure confirmed.

We will, however, once more take up the passage in the Book of Acts. The question is—Are the same persons called by St. Paul both Presbyters and Bishops? It is evident, from all that is gone before, that we cannot arrive at any demonstrative proof. We must after all rest contented with a probable conclusion. It seems, then, not an untenable

[1] Probably by Pelagius. Opp. S. Hieron. tom. v. 1089. ed. Ben.

opinion that the same persons are not called by St. Paul "Presbyters" and "Bishops." The reasons of that opinion are: first, that in the whole Book of Acts there is no other passage which renders such an usage of words probable; and, secondly, that the use of the words "Bishop" and "Deacon," in the Epistle to Timothy, so appears to square with the state of the Church of Jerusalem under the two orders of Apostles and Deacons as to render the restricted and appropriate use of the names more probable than their indiscriminate application;[1] thirdly, Theophylact, commenting on the place, says, "It is to be observed that those whom he before calls Presbyters he here calls Bishops, that is, because Presbyters necessarily oversee the reasonable flock of the Church, lest any should be weak in faith, lest any hunger or thirst, or stand in need of reproof and restoration; or he thus *calls Bishops them who were really Bishops.*"[2]

And this brings us again upon the words of St. Irenæus, which I will now give with the comment of Bishop Pearson: "Irenæus did not think that, the same men in that place were called 'Bishops' and 'Presbyters,' or that they belonged to the church of one city. For as he says, lib. iii. c. 14, 'The Bishops and Presbyters who came from Ephesus, and the rest of the neighbouring cities, being called together at Miletus.' According to the opinion of Irenæus, St. Paul

[1] See page 122, and the note. [2] Theophylact. in loc.

called to him both Bishops and Presbyters: he did not call them together therefore from one city alone, nor did he call only the rulers of the second order, nor style them 'Bishops.' This place in the Book of Acts Chrysostom, Jerome, and others, in the fourth and following centuries, quote, and lay as the foundation of their opinions, chiefly disputing as about one city alone. Irenæus, a writer of the second century, and much nigher to the Apostles and Apostolic men, never so much as dreamed of such a thing."[1] To this we may add that Irenæus was born probably at Smyrna, and about the year A.D. 97-8,[2] that is, within thirty or five-and-thirty years after the visit of St. Paul to Miletus; that he was the disciple of Polycarp, who was Bishop of Smyrna and a companion of the Apostles; and that Smyrna was a suffragan church under the metropolitan jurisdiction of Ephesus.[3] All these things are so many probabilities in favour of St. Irenæus's thorough knowledge of the then condition of the Asiatic churches; and therefore give his words a weight that no other uninspired Christian writer seems to possess on the point in question. It would follow, then, that the Presbyters from Ephesus were the Presbytery of that church over which, if not already at that time, at least within a time indefinitely short, as we shall see, Timothy is

[1] Vind. Ignat. c. xiii. See also Bishop Andrewes' Concio ad Clerum on Acts xx. 28. Opuscula, p. 25. The difficulty, however, in Tit. i. 5—7 still remains.

[2] Cave's Histor. Lit. in voc. Irenæus.

[3] Bingham, Orig. Eccl., book ix. c. iii. ix.

proved by Holy Scripture to be bishop. At this convention he was probably present. The Bishops, in this view, came from the neighbouring cities. But be this as it may. If any one still prefer the opinion of St. Chrysostom, which has been adopted by Hooker and Hammond, it will equally accord with our main argument. We will therefore dismiss the names, and take up once more the question, whether the Apostles committed to many, or to one, the power of ruling and ordaining in the Church.

That the ultimate form in which St. Paul left the polity of the churches founded by him was an Episcopate of one person, is, I conceive, put beyond doubt by Holy Scripture. The Epistles to Timothy and Titus were written in the years A.D. 64-66, that is, towards the end of his life, when for that reason he was providing for the continuance of the Church by succession, and thereby for leaving it after his death in the same form in which it had been settled during his life, when he exercised himself the oversight, or Apostolical Episcopate, of all churches of his planting; and by these two documents it is incontestably proved that Timothy was sole ruler in Ephesus, and Titus in Crete, as the delegates, representatives, and successors of St. Paul.

Now the First Epistle to Timothy was written either when St. Paul passed into Macedonia, leaving him at Ephesus, or shortly afterwards; and the mention of this event is to remind Timothy of his original appointment to that Church. It was written therefore either before or after the summoning

of the Presbyters from Ephesus to Miletus. Either way the proof will hold that, a little before, or a few years after that convention, Timothy was bishop over them, and the supreme government of the Church was committed to him alone. In fact he was to them what St. James was to the Presbyters at Jerusalem; and lest it should seem that this was a temporary commission, we have the second Epistle to Timothy, written, on one supposition, two, on another, many years after the first, and on any supposition at the very end of St. Paul's life, when he was "now ready to be offered, and the time" of his "departure was at hand."

I forbear in the case of Timothy, as in that of St. James, to cite the abundant historical evidence which proves that he was in the strictest sense Bishop of Ephesus. We are arguing from Holy Scripture. It will not, however, be amiss to remember that the argument here offered is in exact accordance with the whole body of historical evidence, and any other in diametrical opposition to it.

We will now examine, from the internal evidence of the Epistles, first, whence he derived his commission; and, next, with what powers he was invested over the Ephesian Presbyters.

As to his commission, we read it was from St. Paul himself: "I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus."[1] But the gift which he received, that is the grace which accompanied the Episcopate, was given him by the "laying on of the hands of the

[1] 1 Tim. i. 3.

Presbytery."[1] Here we seem to return into the original difficulty. Let us first see therefore how they whose authority is used for the community of names deal with this passage. St. Chrysostom's comment is, "He does not here speak of Presbyters, but of Bishops, for Presbyters did not ordain a Bishop." Theophylact repeats his words. Theodoret says, "He calls the office of teaching a gift (χάρισμα), and those that were deemed worthy of the apostolic grace the 'presbytery.'" Now it comes to this—either they were Bishops, or they were not. If they were Bishops in Acts xx. 28, they are so here, and the difficulty vanishes: if not in either place, we must look for some other solution. And we need not to look far. In the first chapter of the second Epistle, St. Paul writes, "Stir up the gift that is in thee by the putting on of *my* hands."[2] What can then be the meaning of the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery? The Apostle declares himself to be the sole ordainer of Timothy. I say sole, because he was the sufficient authority; and as for the rest, it may be that Silas, Paul's fellow-worker, and St. Luke, the companion of his journeys, and, it may be also, gifted persons, as in the mission of St. Paul himself to the Gentiles,[3] were joint partakers of the act. And this last supposition has a direct countenance from the words of St. Paul to Timothy where he says, "This charge I commit to thee, son Timothy, according *to the prophecies*

[1] 1 Tim. iv. 14. [2] 2 Tim. i. 6. [3] Acts xiii. 1.

which went before on thee."[1] And, after all, the Apostle himself declaring that his own hands ordained Timothy, why may we not also conceive that the Presbytery of the Church expressed their acceptance of their spiritual ruler by joining in the act?[2]

[1] 1 Tim. i. 18. Comp. the prophecy of Agabus on St. Paul. Acts xxi. 10, 11.

[2] If, on such a point as this, a conjecture is not of much weight, yet it can at least do no harm to cite certain remarkable facts which seem to look towards the supposition in the text. It is well known that Presbyters, who have neither singly nor collectively the power of ordaining Presbyters, are nevertheless permitted by the Catholic Church to express their consent or concurrence in the ordination of their brethren by laying their hands, with the Bishop, on the head of the candidate for the priesthood. It is certain that such a privilege has been permitted even in the consecration of Bishops. We find Pope Pelagius was consecrated by the imposition of the hands of two Bishops and one Presbyter, a priest of Ostia. (See Mason's Vindication of the Church of England, &c., p. 41.) This is on the authority of Anastasius, and admitted by Baronius and Binius. There is also an answer of St. Gregory the Great to St. Augustin, which is even more in point. St. Augustin, in the early part of his mission in Britain, when he desired to consecrate Mellitus and Justus, wrote to ask, "If the Bishops are so far apart one from another that they cannot conveniently assemble, whether may a Bishop be ordained without the presence of other Bishops?" Gregory answered—"In the Church of England, in which only thou art as yet a Bishop, thou canst not ordain at all but in the absence of other Bishops. For when do any Bishops come out of France to assist you in ordaining Bishops? We will therefore that you ordain Bishops; but so that they may not be far one from another, that there be no such necessity but that they may hereafter come together at the creation of others. And the other pastors, whose presence is highly useful, may readily assemble." Bede, Eccl. Hist., lib. i. xxvii. Here pastors evidently are distinguished from bishops. (See Mason, Vind., pp. 92, 93.) We find in Morinus de Prim. Ord. Exercit. ii. c. iii. vi., the decree of election (preserved in the Euchologium), which was read out at the con-

We will now go on to the powers with which Timothy was invested. And we may remark at the outset that, whatsoever share the Presbyters may have had in the imposition of hands, Timothy was intrusted with a sole and supreme power over them.

First, he was charged to witness the true doctrine of Christ;[1] and to take heed that no man should teach any other:[2] next, he was empowered to exercise discipline over the flock; to rebuke, reprove, and exhort;[3] and, if need be, to reject from the communion of the Church: again, he was intrusted with authority to take cognizance of the character and lives of Bishops,[4] Presbyters,[5] and Deacons.[6] Of Presbyters it is especially said, "Let the elders (Presbyters) that rule well be counted worthy

secration of Bishops. He gives it as follows: "If the Patriarch be the consecrator, the decree runs, 'by the suffrage and approbation of the most sacred Metropolitans, Archbishops, and Bishops;' if a Metropolitan be consecrator, thus: 'by the suffrage and approbation of the Bishops most acceptable to God, and the reverend Presbyters.' When the Patriarch ordains, that is in a patriarchal province, Bishops, Archbishops, and Metropolitans only concur in the election; but when a Metropolitan, the Presbyters also." And in this we may find some precedent, such as it is, for the strange custom of the Romanists in England and Ireland, who, "during the greater part if not the whole of the last century," as Mr. Palmer says, "had Bishops consecrated by one Bishop and two Priests, which was done by authority of a bull, permitting, for the "increase of their conveniency," that, in lieu of witnesses, two secular priests should assist. See Palmer's Treatise, vol. ii. pp. 469, 470.

[1] 1 Tim. vi. 12, 13, 14; 2 Tim. i. 13; iii. 14-17.
[2] 1 Tim. i. 3; vi. 3, 4, 5. [3] 1 Tim. v. 20; 2 Tim. iv. 2.
[4] 1 Tim. iii. 1. [5] 1 Tim. v. 17, 19.
[6] 1 Tim. iii. 8, &c.

of double honour, especially they who labour in the word and doctrine. Against an elder (Presbyter) receive not an accusation but before two or three witnesses;"[1] and, lastly, Timothy was empowered to continue the succession of the Church by the laying on of hands,[2] that is, by ordination. The same office may be shown to be vested also in Titus for his Episcopate over the whole of Crete. Only one passage, as bearing directly upon the chief point at issue, need be cited. "For this cause," says St. Paul, "left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain Presbyters in every city."[3] Now to this single point of ordination we may henceforward confine our inquiry; and in the first place it must be observed, that there is no one passage in the whole of the New Testament in which Presbyters are said to lay on hands, except that which has been already quoted above; and there St. Paul declares that he himself was the authority of the ordination—I mean in the case of Timothy; and in the second place it must be observed that, in the commissions given to Timothy and Titus, the power of ordination is intrusted to them alone. In this one point may be said to lie the *differentia* of the episcopal office.

We have already seen St. Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Theophylact arguing that the Presbytery were Bishops, because they laid hands on Timothy;

[1] See above, page 102. [2] 1 Tim. v. 22; 2 Tim. ii. 2.
[3] Titus i. 5.

and St. Chrysostom asserting that Bishops exceed Presbyters in the power of ordaining only.

We will now take the evidence of St. Jerome, an authority trite and acknowledged by all the impugners of the Episcopate. In his well-known epistle to Evangelus (al. Evagrius), he contends for the community of names, and is supposed to contend for the identity of orders. The truth is, he wrote for the purpose of repressing the self-elation of the Roman Deacons, who, through their riches and influence in the Church, endeavoured to set themselves before the Presbyters.[1] He proves the great interval of dignity between a Deacon and a Presbyter by saying that a Presbyter is almost equal to a Bishop. This, one would have thought, should have sufficiently expressed St. Jerome's mind, and preserved his isolated words from misinterpretation. After giving his view of the origin of the episcopal order, he adds, "What does a Bishop do that a Presbyter cannot, *except ordination?*"[2] And this is the only point we are now

[1] "Audio quendam in tantam erupisse vecordiam, ut Diaconos, Presbyteris, id est Episcopis anteferret;" and afterwards: "Si ex Diacono ordinatur Presbyter, noverit se lucris minorem, Sacerdotio esse majorem."

[2] It is remarkable that there are not more than two or three instances of apparent ordination by Presbyters bearing a sufficiently probable character to be cited by the adversaries of the sole episcopal power. Bishop Stillingfleet, in his Irenicum, a book written when he was about four-and-twenty years old, after showing that the power of ordination was by the laws of the Church restricted to Bishops, wishes to prove that nevertheless the ordination of Presbyters was not declared invalid. From the tract of sixteen

concerned with. Of his other opinions we shall speak hereafter.

hundred years he brings three cases, two in the fourth and one in the fifth century. Their value will readily appear.

The first is that of the Abbot Daniel, A.D. 390, who is supposed to have been made Deacon by Paphnutius, a Presbyter of the desert. This is on the authority of Cassian, whose words are, "So greatly did Paphnutius delight in his virtues, that he hastened to equal with himself in the honour of the priesthood a man whom he knew to be his peer in merit and the grace of life. For he could by no means endure that he should tarry longer in a lower ministry; and, desiring to provide for himself a worthy successor, in his own lifetime, he raised him by the honour of the priesthood." In the first place, who does not see that the point of the last sentence lies in the word "superstes,"—that Daniel was made Presbyter with a view to the succession, while Paphnutius was yet alive? In this there was a departure from the usual course. Plainly it was not the habit therefore of the superior of the monastery to ordain his successor. But in truth it is nowhere said that Paphnutius did ordain him, but "co-æquare" and "provexit" may well consist with the known and notorious rule in the ordination of monks, namely, that the Superior should select and send them to the Bishop in whose jurisdiction the monastery was situated. By the rule of St. Benedict it is ordered, "If any Abbot should desire to have a Presbyter or Deacon ordained, let him choose from the number of his brethren one that is meet to discharge the priestly office." Reg. D. Bened. cap. 6. See Cassian. Coll. 4, 1, note 6. As to the monasteries of the East, they were not exempt from the Diocesan Episcopate. "Coæquat," and "provexit" can in no way signify "ordain." So far as in him lay, Paphnutius equalled Daniel to himself, and preferred him, that is chose him to be made his equal, and preferred to the priesthood. Without other evidence, and against the otherwise acknowledged and universal practice of the Church, and of all monasteries, this not only proves really nothing, but is even no ground of probable reasoning. I may add Fleury's account of the case: "Daniel était principalement recommandable par son humilité. Paphnuce le fit ordonner diacre, le préférant à plusieurs autres plus âgés, et même ensuite il le fit élever au sacerdoce." Histoire Eccl., lib. xx. c. vii.

The second case is the consecration of Pope Pelagius, in which

The power of ordination, then, was first reserved in the hands of the Apostles, and afterwards commit-

two bishops and one priest assisted. This case is simply irrelevant. The consecration would have been valid at the hands of one bishop. The utmost that can be deduced from it is, that the priest by imposition of hands expressed a subordinate concurrence in the act of a superior, which was valid without his participation. But I have considered this case already in the note to page 137.

The third and last case is the only one which presents any difficulty. St. Leo, writing to Rusticus Narbonensis, who had asked his judgment of some Presbyters who took upon them to ordain as Bishops, answers—"Those clergymen who were ordained by such as took upon them the office of Bishops in churches belonging to proper Bishops, if the ordination were performed by the consent of the Bishops, it may be looked on as valid, and those Presbyters remain in their office in the Church." "Otherwise the creation (ordination) is to be held null which has neither the foundation of a place (*i. e.* a cure or church), nor is confirmed by authority." So Stillingfleet words it. Now it will be best to give St. Leo's answer entire, and as it stands: "No reason allows that they should be regarded as Bishops who are neither elected by the clergy, nor desired by the people, nor consecrated by the provincial Bishops, with the approbation of the metropolitan. Wherefore, since a question often arises concerning an honour (*i. e.* ecclesiastical rank) which has been irregularly received, who doubts that what is not shown to be conferred on them may by no means be attributed to them? But if any clergy are ordained by these mock-bishops (pseudo-episcopi) in those churches which belong to their own bishops, and their ordination is made by the consent and judgment of the bishops (Præsidentium), it may be held as valid, so that they may continue in the churches. Otherwise the ordination (creatio) is null, being grounded in no place (*i. e.* a cure or church), and confirmed by no authority." Now from this it would seem rather that the "pseudo-episcopi" were not simple Presbyters, but men who had obtained some irregular episcopal consecration. For which reason St. Leo recites in full the conditions of a lawful consecration. What need had he to say this of a mere Presbyter? or of any but those who claimed consecration as Bishops? There is no mention of Presbyter in the whole epistle. Now it is as plain as any conjecture can be that these pseudo-epis-

ted, as in Timothy and Titus, to Bishops. St. Chrysostom calls "the power of ordination the chiefest of all, and that which above all holds the Church together."[1] It was for this reason that it was reserved to Timothy over Ephesus and the subject churches, and to Titus over Crete with its hundred cities. What St. Cyprian observes on the commission given

copi were Chorepiscopi, who were consecrated not as the provincial bishops, in the full canonical order recited by St. Leo, but by one bishop. This practice, which had grown into the churches in Gaul, was severely reprehended by Damasus, Leo, John III. and Leo III. These Chorepiscopi were consecrated by the Diocesan Bishops to help them in their labours; but so that they should not confirm or ordain without express consent given to that effect by the bishop of the diocese. To this Leo alludes (consensu et judicio Præsidentium). The Chorepiscopi by degrees violated this restriction to such an extent as to bring on their entire suppression. And the office of Presbyter Chorepiscopus, or Archdeacon, prevailed in their stead. Now, writing of these Chorepiscopi, John III. says, "All the chief councils affirm that he is no Bishop who is made Bishop by fewer than three Bishops, with the authority of the Metropolitan; and therefore that those whom you call Chorepiscopi, inasmuch as they are consecrated as we hear by one Bishop, are no Bishops, and ought not to assume any sacred function of the pontifical (episcopal) privileges." Morinus de Sacr. Ord. ad Exercit. iv. c. ii. 8. These are exactly the pseudo-episcopi of St. Leo. Their consecration was real, by apostolical authority, and therefore their ordination was not to be iterated; but their consecration was uncanonical, and therefore every episcopal act was usurpation except "consensu et judicio Præsidentium." They were then, or by after-submission of the party ordained, valid, and accepted by the Diocesan Bishop. That this is St. Leo's meaning is beyond a doubt; and his letter, having no reference to simple Presbyters, is irrelevant to the end for which Stillingfleet adduced it.

[1] "*πάντων μάλιστα κυριώτατον, καὶ ὁ μάλιστα συνέχει τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν, τὸ τῶν χειροτονιῶν.*" Vindic. Ignat. c. xiii.

first to St. Peter alone is true also here. The source and springhead of power began from one as a type and pledge of unity. That the preservation of unity was the final end of the Episcopate, St. Jerome again and again asserts, as, for instance, in his dialogue with the Luciferians, where he argues, "The safety of the Church hangs upon the dignity of the chief priest, to whom if there were not given a power extraordinary and above other men, there would be made as many schisms as there are priests."[1] And he proceeds further, in the above-cited Epistle to Evangelus, to give an account of the first rise of the Episcopate: "That one was afterwards chosen out and set over the rest was done as a corrective of schism, lest every man, drawing Christ's Church to himself, should rend it."[2] And in his commentary on the Epistle to Titus, he says, "A Presbyter is the same as a Bishop, and before that, by the instigation of the Devil, factions were made in religion, and it was said among the people, I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas, the churches were governed by the common council of the Presbyters. But after that each one regarded those he had baptized, not as Christ's, but as his own, it was decreed in all the world that one chosen out from among the Presbyters should be set over the rest, to whom

[1] Morinus de Ordinat. Sacr. P. iii. c. ii. 3. See also S. Cypr. Ep. 55.

[2] Ad Evangelum, tom. v. p. 803. ed. Ben.

should belong the charge of the whole Church, and thereby the seeds of schism be rooted out."[1] Now upon this passage it must be observed that, if taken to deny the Apostolical institution of the Episcopate, it is *gratis dictum;* having no warrant of history: it is a theory inconsistent with the teaching of the three first ages after the Apostles; and with the plain declarations of Holy Scripture, which prove that the sole power of Timothy and Titus was given by the Apostle himself.

In the next place, it is said that this universal rule of electing a single Presbyter to be Bishop arose upon the schisms of the Church. That is to say, the Apostles acted not by foresight and prevention, but by after-judgment, to correct an evil which was both foreseen and foretold. How far this is consonant with the Divine wisdom, by which they were guided, any plain man will readily decide; and how far it is consonant with the evidence of history may be seen from the fact that the schisms of which Jerome speaks, at Corinth, arose about A.D. 55, which is the date of St. Paul's Epistle, and we already find St. James at Jerusalem, presiding over the Presbyters of that Church, and, according to Eusebius, Euodius at Antioch, who was made Bishop in the year A.D. 44.[2] Now whether the testimony of Eusebius is intrinsically valid is no question. It is at least good against that of St. Jerome, nay even

[1] S. Hierom. in Tit. i. 5.

[2] By the Chronology of Syncellus, A.D. 40.

better, as are all detailed testimonies against sweeping assertions; and certainly it is more trustworthy on other grounds, Eusebius being more than half a century earlier, an Asiatic Greek, and himself bishop of a neighbouring city.

The fact is that this precedence, from what cause soever it arose, existed before the schisms which Jerome imagined to have produced it.[1] The successions of the churches of Jerusalem and Antioch are older than the Epistle to the Corinthians.

And lastly, I would observe that Jerome says "toto orbe decretum"—it was decreed in the whole world. In his commentary on Titus, he says: "As Presbyters know that they are subject to him that is set over them by the custom of the Church (ecclesiæ consuetudine), so let Bishops know that they are greater than Presbyters, rather by custom than by the nature of the Lord's dispensation." But he immediately destroys his argument by a parallel between Moses and the seventy Elders. Surely Moses had both supreme power and precedence "dispositionis Dominicæ veritate." But Jerome says this was an universal custom, and begun in the course of the apostolic ministry, and, therefore, he must mean by the Apostles: yet his words, "decreed in the whole world," give it an appearance as if it were the act, not of inspired, but uninspired men.[2] If it

[1] Morinus de Ord. Sacr. P. iii. c. 3. 20.

[2] In the same Epistle to Evangelus, St. Jerome makes the following statement, which has been eagerly used by the gainsayers

was so decreed, let the decree be produced. Or if it be not forthcoming, let us rather listen to St. Augustin, who, while Jerome was thus writing from the east, taught another and a sounder rule in Africa. "What the whole Church holds, instituted by no council, but always maintained, is most rightly believed to flow from no authority but that of the

of the Episcopal order:—"At Alexandria, from the time of Mark the Evangelist to the Bishops Heraclas and Dionysius, the Presbyters were always wont to choose one out of their own number and place him in a higher grade, and call him Bishop, as the army makes the Emperor; and the Deacons choose of their own number one whose diligence they know, and call him Archdeacon. For what does a Bishop do that a Presbyter may not, except ordain? &c." From this it has been argued that by election, and without consecration, a Presbyter became Bishop of Alexandria; which is contrary to the whole current of historical testimony. Even Morinus is led to suppose this to be Jerome's meaning, because no *ecclesiastical ceremony was used in the consecration of emperors* for some centuries after Jerome's day. His argument would then be this: because the emperors were not consecrated before the practice of consecrating them was instituted, therefore neither were Bishops, though the practice of consecrating them was universal and from the beginning. But in truth Morinus has missed St. Jerome's meaning. He compares the two elections, not the consequent ceremonies. All he had to shew was that Presbyters border so closely on the Episcopate, that they had the right of choosing their own bishop. In fact it is no more than is possessed by most churches of Western Europe at this day. But his own words show this, for whence could the elected Bishop obtain the power of ordination, which the Presbyters themselves did not possess? The truth is, he had no need to speak of consecration, and therefore wholly omits it. Moreover it is recorded that St. Mark ordained Anianus or Ananias to the see of Alexandria; and that the Patriarch of that church was consecrated by the neighbouring bishops from time immemorial. See Hammond, Diss. quatuor quibus Episcopatus Jura &c. iii. x. Works, vol. iii. 792.

Apostles."[1] This universal fact of an episcopal regimen can be explained by no cause short of an uni-

[1] Much stress is laid by those who deny the apostolical institution of orders upon the following passage of Tertullian, in which he is supposed to reduce the priesthood of the Church to a matter of internal ecclesiastical discipline. "Are not we laymen also priests? It is written—'He hath made us a kingdom, and priests unto God and His Father.' The difference between the order (of Priests) and the people is constituted by the authority of the Church; and the dignity which is in the consistory of the priesthood is sanctified; insomuch that where the consistory and the ecclesiastical order is not found, thou makest oblation, and baptizest, and art a priest unto thyself alone. But where three are, although they be laymen, there is the Church." De Exhort. castitatis, c. vii.

Now a slight regard to the context will clear this difficulty. In recommending chastity he falls on the subject of second marriages. He says they are forbidden to the priesthood. He supposes an objector to say, "Therefore it is lawful to others whom he excepts. Sed dices, ergo cæteris licet, quos excipit." *i. e.*, the laity. He answers, "We are foolish if we fancy that what is not lawful for priests is lawful for laymen. Are not we laymen also priests?" &c.

First, then, it is plain that Tertullian means to refute the idea that in the nature of morals there are two rules, one for priests, another for laymen. He contends that all moral beings, before God, are alike.

Next he teaches that the standing priesthood is an expression, or embodying, of the spiritual actions of the whole body.

And lastly, by "Ecclesiæ auctoritas," he clearly means to include the apostolic as much as Jerome does in the "Ecclesiæ consuetudo," and "toto orbe decretum."

All that Tertullian is concerned to shew is that the difference between the laity and priesthood has a *positive* and not a *moral* origin—that it is not a *differentia per se*, but a *differentia ex constituto*.

For the last words "Where three are, &c.," see St. Cyprian de Unitate "Dominus enim cum discipulis suis unitatem suaderet, &c." p. 198. ed. Ben. He means that the Church resides even in its ultimate integral parts, however small.

And

versal agency, which was harmonious and alike in every place. We know of none such since the mission of the Apostles. They that gainsay must account for it.[1]

We may now sum up the evidence of Scripture on this point. It is plain that the Lord Jesus Christ himself ordained his Apostles, and that the Apostles ordained Deacons to be their first assistants; that in a few years, without any mention of their institution, a body of Presbyters is found in the Church, subject to the Apostles, sometimes to one Apostle; that to these Presbyters the sole power

And last of all it must be remembered that Tertullian's book de Exhort. castitatis was written after he had turned Montanist, and committed schism. See Bishop of Lincoln's Tertullian, p. 62.

[1] For those who have an impression that the Apostles did not institute the government by Bishops, but that uninspired men after the Apostles' times introduced it, the following passage from Chillingworth fairly puts an argument which I have never seen as fairly met. "When I shall see, therefore, all the Fables of the Metamorphosis acted, and prove true stories; when I shall see all the democracies and aristocracies in the world lie down and sleep and awake into monarchies; then will I begin to believe that Presbyterial government, having continued in the Church during the Apostles' time, should presently after (against the Apostles' doctrine, and the will of Christ) be whirled about like a scene in a mask, and transformed into Episcopacy. In the meantime, while these things remain thus incredible, and, in human reason, impossible, I hope I shall have leave to conclude thus:

"Episcopal government is acknowledged to have been universally received in the Church presently after the Apostles' times.

"Between the Apostles' times and this 'presently after' there was not time enough for any possibility of so great an alteration.

"And therefore there was no such alteration as is pretended; and therefore Episcopacy, being confessed to be so ancient and Catholic, must be granted also to be Apostolic. Quod erat demonstrandum." The Apostolical Instit. of Episcopacy, Works, 490. ii.

of ordaining, and ruling the Church, was never given; that to Timothy and Titus both of these functions were committed severally and in full; that we once read of Presbyters joining subordinately with St. Paul in an act of ordination; that we nowhere read of their taking any such act as a body without an Apostle; and, lastly, that we find, in two or three passages, the name "Bishop" apparently given to them.

From all these premises we may conclude, first, that so long as the power of ruling and ordaining was restrained in the hands of the Apostles, they may have acted as Curators of the several Churches by a sort of vicarious Episcopate — an office still assigned to Cathedral Presbyteries in the Catholic Church during the vacancy of any see. If I may so say, the Episcopate in its lower functions, *for we nowhere read of their ordaining*, was put into commission: they were none of them severally Bishops, as Timothy and Titus, but all together exercised such functions of the Episcopate as they were severally capable of. They may have therefore partaken of the name, as, "sede nondum constitutâ," they did of the authority.

Secondly, we may conclude that the power of ordaining and of ruling the Church was nowhere committed to more than one alone. The Apostles, as they possessed the fullness of their divine commission in themselves, so they gave out portions of it, according to the needs of the Church; and the

rest they retained in their own hands, until they made provision for their departure from the Church on earth by bequeathing the whole Apostolic authority to their successors. Therefore we find, first, an order of assistants with powers very limited: namely, the Deacons.

And next in order, with powers much enlarged, taking precedence of the Deacons, joining in the councils of the Church, and all but equal to the Apostles, to whom, however, they are always found in a carefully expressed subordination, we find a body of Presbyters.

The Presbyters, therefore, were the material or basis of the future Episcopate. Bishops were not needed so long as the Apostles themselves kept the oversight of all Churches;[1] and, therefore, in the early history of the Church, as contained in the Book of Acts, we have no record of the act of instituting a bishopric. As the time drew on for the departure of the Apostles, they were constituted, as at Jerusalem; and therefore it is to the Epistles to Timothy and Titus, St. Paul's latest writings, that we must look for the form to which the Churches of his planting had grown up under his hand. He had reared the temple to the coping-stone, and then, as the last act, he fixed the pinnacle. He was to depart from them, and he left Timothy and Titus as his representatives. And this brings me to the last point I shall touch upon. In

[1] Morinus de Sacris Ordin. P. iii. c. iii. 15.

thus committing the plenitude of their authority to one, and only one in each Church, it is evident that the Apostles acted upon the rule which our Lord himself had sanctioned by His own practice. As a type of unity, He first committed the Apostolic power to St. Peter,[1] but afterwards to all the

[1] It is as certain that the precedence of the Church of Rome has no divine or apostolical warrant, as that St. Peter had a precedence among the Apostles by the implied disposition of our Lord. No one who has examined Holy Scripture and the Fathers of the Church can doubt of this; but the real question is not whether or no he had a precedence, which all well-instructed divines admit, but in what that precedence consisted. Whatsoever that precedence was, it was a precedence among those who had received equal power with himself. The same testimonies which ascribe to him a precedence, assert everywhere with greater strength and point the equality of all the Apostles.

It is evident from Holy Scripture that the precedence of St. Peter was a priority in point of time. He first confessed Christ to be the Son of God, and he first received the promise of the apostolic power. St. Matth. xvi. 16—19. But they all received it afterwards. St. John xx. 21, 22, 23. He first opened the apostolic commission at the appointment of Matthias, and at the day of Pentecost opened the kingdom of Heaven to the Jews, and at the conversion of Cornelius to the Gentiles. To him was committed "the gospel of the circumcision," Gal. ii. 7; *i. e.* the office and ministry of tendering the Gospel to the Jews. Throughout Judæa and Asia and in every place this was first done, and a foundation of Jewish converts laid, on which the Gentile converts were afterwards built. Thus the ministry of St. Peter came first, that of St. Paul came afterwards, and we find in the Book of Acts that the preaching of St. Peter is recorded down to the conversion of Cornelius. Then follows the preaching of St. Paul. The whole Church, therefore, is built on the Gospel of the Circumcision, the ministry of St. Peter, and so on St. Peter himself. The interpretation of the words of Christ in Matth. xvi. 18, was very various in the Catholic Church. St. Augustin interpreted the Rock either of Peter or of Christ, and invites the reader to make his

Apostles. They all were what Peter was; endowed with an equal share in the fellowship of an equal

choice. He says the former interpretation was in the mouths of many, being in a song of Ambrose. But he inclines himself to the latter; and that in his Retractations, lib. i. c. xxi. To this it should be added that thirty-six Fathers and Doctors of the Church of all ages and nations in the East and the West, including ten Popes, interpret the Rock to be the true Faith. Palmer's Treatise, vol. ii. p. 484.

Now as to the sense of the Fathers. St. Peter is often spoken of as chief, and leader, and Coryphæus, &c., of the Apostles (*τῶν χορῶν τῶν Ἀποστόλων κορυφαίος, Ἀποστόλων κορυφαιότατος, προήγορος, ἀρχηγὸς, πρόεδρος, ἔξαρχος, προστάτης*, &c. and by the Latins as Princeps, Primus, &c. (See Nectarius confut. Imper. Papæ, p. 119—225.) The same titles are given to the other Apostles. Chrysostom calls Andrew, James, and John *κορυφάιος* in several places. He calls also James and John "two Coryphæuses." Hom. xxxii. in St. Matth. Nectarius defines "Coryphæus" to be "primus ordine inter eos qui sunt ejusdem ordinis." But the same writers testify also that all the Apostles were of equal power. St. Cyprian we have already seen saying—"the other Apostles were what Peter was, endowed with an equal plenitude both of honour and power." (De Unit. Eccl.) St. Ambrose: "When Peter heard 'But whom say ye that I am?' immediately remembering his place, he takes the precedence—the precedence indeed in confession, not in honour—the precedence in faith, not in order." "Hear him saying, 'I will give thee the keys,' what is said to Peter is said to the other Apostles." Chrysostom says—"All in common were intrusted with the care of the whole world." Cyril of Alexandria says—"Peter and John were equal in honour to each other." Victor of Carthage: "To the Church all the blessed Apostles, endued with an equal fellowship of honour and power, brought multitudes of people." The fifth Œcumenical Synod declares that "the grace of the Holy Spirit abounded in each of the Apostles, so that they needed not the counsel of any other in the things that should be done." Origen, Cyprian, Jerome, Augustine, Etherius, and others, interpret "the Rock" of the Apostles generally (see Ephes. ii. 20; Rev. xxi. 14). These passages are given by Mr. Palmer, vol. ii. pp. 480-484; and every one fami-

authority. Not that they were dependent one on another, so as to be unable to act except in an united college. Each severally was absolute. Under God, he had no one set over him. Each one was a vicar and vicegerent of Christ. Each one, in every land wheresoever they were scattered abroad, carried with him the whole mystery of the Gospel; all its truths, and sacraments, and powers. As each one had in himself the faith, so he had the polity of the Church in all its plenitude; and as Christ their Lord had intrusted His own commission in full to each one of their body, so did they in like manner. They had represented Him, and now they constituted representatives of Him and of themselves. They therefore made over, in like manner, their commission in full to chosen men, who in their stead should be to each several Church the Vicars of Christ and of

liar with the Fathers will know that they may be multiplied to a great extent. But this is enough to show that the precedence of St. Peter in no way affected the absolute, independent equality of power in each several Apostle; and so if it were true, as it cannot be shown, that any Christian Bishop had succeeded to his precedence, it could in like manner no way affect the absolute independent equality of each Catholic Bishop. As St. Paul withstood St. Peter at Antioch, so might any bishop withstand the successor of his precedence. I have thought it best to throw these few remarks into a note, because the present is not the occasion for entering into a subject of this extent; and because, having in the text referred to the precedence of St. Peter, and also the precedence of the Roman Patriarch (see page 98), between which no connexion by divine or apostolical appointment can be shown, it is not necessary to introduce these observations into the context of the book. The precedence of Rome has another origin, and that has been already noticed. On this point see Thorndike's Epilogue, Book iii. c. 6, xviii.

God; and on this is founded the rule which is as old as the Apostolic age. "Wheresoever the Bishop appears, there let the multitude be, even as wheresoever is Christ Jesus, there is the Catholic Church."[1] "There is one God and one Christ the Lord, one Holy Ghost, and so ought there to be one Bishop in a Catholic Church."[2] This, then, is the ultimate form of organic unity. "The Church departs not from Christ, and they are the Church (who are) a people united to the Priest—a flock cleaving to its pastor; for the Bishop is in the Church, and the Church in the Bishop."[3] So, in every several Church, the successor and representative of the Apostles is the visible centre, type, source, and bond of unity. He, with his Presbytery and assistant Deacons, is an image and reflex of the whole Church—an integral and homogeneous part which coalesces with every other. And, for collective unity, all the Bishops of the Catholic Church at large are one College. They are to the Church of these latter times what the Apostolic College was to the Church in the beginning—all equal in sacerdotal power, but ordered according to ecclesiastical use and custom. In and under them the Church Catholic is one. There is, then, a collective unity of all particular Churches, with their several Bishops, in one Catholic body under the Episcopal

[1] S. Ignat. ad Smyrn. [2] S. Cypr. Ep. xlvi.
[3] S. Cypr. Ep. lxix.

College; and there is a distributed or several unity in each particular Church, under its own Bishop. This unity of the Church, therefore, inheres in the one origin, the one succession, and the one College of Catholic Bishops; and here we may leave the subject of organic unity.

We now come to the second division of this subject; namely, the Moral Unity of the Church. By this expression I would be understood to mean what is often called the Unity of Communion. The basis of this unity is the subjective state of the moral character, and the union of Christian men in the habits of faith, hope, and charity; or, as St. Cyprian expresses it, "Charity, which is greater than hope and faith, is the bond of brotherhood, the foundation of peace, the hold and strength of unity."[1] And St. Augustin, in like manner, says, "It is manifest that Sion is the City of God: what is that City of God but the holy Church? For men who love each other, and also their God, who dwells in them, are unto God a city. As a city is held together by some law, their law is love; and love is God."[2]

This moral unity is evidently a law, not only of the Church and of Revelation, but of nature and of the constitution of mankind. The moral unity of a family is the aboriginal type, and the national unity of a people a partial antitype of the same

[1] De Bono Patientiæ, p. 251. ed. Ben.
[2] Enarratio in Psalm xcviii.

mystery, which has its perfect fulfilment in the Catholic Church alone. It is hardly necessary to recite the types and prophecies, or the parables and the prayer of our Lord, in which this oneness of fellowship in love and good will among all the members of His body is expressed. It will be enough to refer to two passages only as samples of many which will immediately be remembered. For instance, the words of our Lord in St. Mark x. 29, 30, "Verily I say unto you there is no man that hath left home, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for my sake and the Gospel's, but he shall receive an hundredfold, now in this time, houses, and brethren, and sisters, and mothers, and children, and lands; . . . . . and in the world to come, eternal life." And in St. John xvii. 11—21, "Holy Father, keep, through thine own Name, those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one, as we are;" and, "that they all may be one, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us, that the world may believe that thou hast sent me." One or two passages from uninspired writers may be subjoined to shew in what they understood this moral unity of the Church to consist. St. Cyprian, in his treatise on that subject, writes, "The Lord says, 'I and the Father are one.' And again, concerning the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, it is written, 'These three are one.' And does any think that this unity, which springs from the steadfast-

ness of the Godhead, cleaves together with heavenly sacraments, can be rent asunder in the Church, and separated by the divorce of clashing wills? . . . . . This house and resting-place of unanimity the Holy Ghost designs and declares in the Psalms, saying, 'God also makes men to be of one mind in one house.' In the house of God, in the Church of Christ, they who are of one mind dwell, and they who are of one and a single heart persevere."[1] St. Augustin, speaking of the Church, says, "The peace of a family is the well-ordered concord of rule and obedience in them that dwell together: the peace of a city the well-ordered concord of rule and obedience in the citizens. The peace of the Heavenly City is the fellowship of perfect order and concord in the enjoyment of God, and of each other in God."[2]

But in a matter so fully known and acknowledged on all hands, it is not needful to do more than sketch in outline the nature of this moral unity.

It consists, then, of two great elements: subordination and charity—*i.e.*, subordination of Christians to their lawful pastors, and charity towards their brethren in Christ. These two moral elements make up the internal unity of Churches. "They continued steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread and in prayers." Such is the outline of the primary form

[1] De Unit. Eccl. pp. 195, 196. [2] De Civ. Dei, lib. xix. 13.

of Christian unity. In the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship we have the faith and polity, the doctrine and discipline, as explained in the foregoing part of this chapter: in the breaking of bread and in prayers, the moral unity of charity and worship, which is the subject of this.

The "plebs sacerdoti adunata" is the first condition; the reciprocal union of all members of the flock is the second; and these make up the moral unity of every section of the Church. In the union of pastors with each other, and with their Bishop, consists the unity of a diocesan Church. In like manner, in the union of many diocesan Churches throughout the several ecclesiastical distributions of jurisdiction, and of all Churches throughout the whole world, consists the moral unity of subordination to the successors of the Apostles, and of charity with all members in the mystical body of Christ.

Such being the nature of this moral unity, we may shortly state also in what way it is secured and ascertained.

The central point of unity is the communion of the blessed Eucharist, in which Christian men cherish as well as testify subordination and charity to their pastor and his flock; and though the members of the several Churches cannot—because of their primary duty to maintain the first conditions of unity with their own pastor, and also because of remoteness of place and diversity of language—except in certain cases, hold their actual communion with the members of other Churches, yet the sacri-

fice and sacrament of the blessed Eucharist being one and the same in all places, the very act of oblation and communion is actual unity with all branches of the Church.

The Eucharist of the whole Church Catholic is one Eucharist. "We being many are one bread." "In which very sacrament is represented the natural union of our people: for in like manner as many grains gathered, and ground, and mingled in one make one bread, so in Christ, who is the heavenly Bread, we know there is one body to which our multitude is joined and united."[1] And thus, as by one act, all Churches, from the rising to the setting of the sun, have communion with each other, through one and the same sacrifice, in the Court of Heaven.

But, besides this virtual communion, all Churches may testify their moral unity by communicatory letters, whether on matters of public discipline or of private interest. Those of public discipline are such as communicate to other Bishops the consecration of any to a vacant see; or again, the deposition and degradation of pastors, or the excommunication of members of any Church: for these are matters of public concern, all Churches being equally bound to ratify and to act upon any decision or sentence duly and justly pronounced by lawful authority: any man excommunicated in one Church being excommunicated in all, and any man absolved in one being absolved in all.

[1] S. Cypr. Ep. 63.

The communicatory letters of a private sort are those that relate to aids and alms sent to any particular Church in its emergencies; or letters, credential and testimonial, affirming the character and quality of any member of a Church to any or all other Churches into the communion of which he may seek admission.[1]

Another mode of securing and expressing this moral unity is in the practice of holding Synods and Councils, diocesan or general, for common deliberation and definition; and in the unanimous reception and execution of canons and decrees.

The moral unity of the Church, therefore, consists in a communion of all Churches in worship and practice, in friendly intercourse and correspondence, and in all judicial, deliberative, and executive acts.

At the outset of this chapter we proposed to examine in what the unity of the visible portion of the Church consists; and it is now time that we should sum up the result of the inquiry, and bring this part of the subject to an end.

We have found it to consist partly of a definite form of doctrine and discipline delivered to mankind by Christ and his Apostles, and partly of the

[1] "For this was, of old, the glory of the Church, that, from one end of the world to the other, the brethren of each several Church, furnished for their journey with a small symbol, found all to be Fathers and Brethren." S. Basil. Ep. 191.

So Tertullian: "Probant unitatem communicatio pacis, et appellatio fraternitatis, et contesseratio hospitalitatis." De præsc. Hær. xx.

relation and order subsisting among those who received it. We have called these the organic and moral, or the objective and subjective unity of the Church: the organic or objective unity being the identity of the church of any age with the church of the Apostles in the faith and sacraments, and in the commission received from Christ, and transmitted by lawful succession: the moral or subjective unity being oneness of communion internally among the several members of each church, and externally among the several churches throughout the world.

CONCLUSION.

We have now completed the first part of the subject before us. It is of importance, however, that we should make some remarks upon the form, as distinguished from the matter, of the argument which has been used in the foregoing chapters, before we pass on to the second part.

It was not necessary to prove that there exists, among Christians, a doctrine of unity. The only question to be examined was concerning the nature and limitations of that doctrine. It is evidently, therefore, a question not of speculation, or of opinion, but of *fact;* and as a question of fact it is to be decided by external or historical evidence. The truth or falsehood of the doctrine in question is, if I may so speak, accidental to the inquiry. We have to ascertain what is, and has been from the beginning, the belief of Christians respecting the unity of the Church. Now, in seeking for an answer to this question we are necessarily constrained to go to the written documents of the most primitive times. The first and most obvious, as being in the hands and mouths of all Christians, is the Catholic Creed. We were compelled, therefore, to ascertain the an-

tiquity of the article which declares the unity of the Church.

But as this article is capable of many apparent interpretations, it was necessary to ascertain in what sense it was interpreted by the Church in the beginning. We were, therefore, compelled a second time to consult the written documents, partly as interpreters and partly as witnesses; and these documents we find of two sorts, inspired and uninspired. In one sense, it is plainly impossible to treat the subject as a question of simple history from the time that the inspired Scriptures are intermingled with the evidence. They not only attest the historical fact, but also the truth of any doctrine.

At the same time it must be observed, that in this inquiry I have adduced Holy Scripture also as historical evidence. I have not felt myself at liberty as yet to use any arguments, or any form of argument, except that which is strictly and simply of an historical and external sort; and for this reason: There either was or was not a doctrine of unity taught by the Apostles. If there was, that doctrine must be found in their own writings, and in the writings and teaching of their successors. The question then is one of history. I have endeavoured to exhibit the doctrine as it is to be found in the primitive records; but I have carefully abstained from touching on the probable moral design, or final end of this dispensation, and also from all explanation or reply to objections which might seem to lie

against it in its consequences. These we shall consider hereafter. At present we have dealt with the subject as a question of fact; and if I have drawn the foregoing proofs from trustworthy documents, and correctly gathered the sense of the testimonies, I do not see how any one can refuse the conclusion —that the doctrine of Catholic unity as here exhibited is derived from the Apostles of Christ. I wish this to be the more carefully noted, because, in almost every case I am aware of, the objections of controversialists, and the difficulties of simpler minds, are to be found either in the form of *à priori* assumptions as to the nature of unity, or in the untenable consequences which are supposed to follow from the doctrine above stated: as, for instance—It is alleged that God would not tie up His redeeming grace to any mere form; or that, if He has, then all who are without it must be in extreme peril, if not certainly lost. Of the intrinsic inconclusiveness of these two forms of objection we shall have to speak in another place. At present it is only necessary to remark that, when brought in reply to positive evidence of *fact*, they are simply *irrelevant*. I do not say that objections may not be brought against the statements already made in this work; but I may say that no objections will be relevant, except such as will show either that the *sense* of the testimonies adduced has been incorrectly given, or, if correctly, that the *testimonies* are themselves without weight.

PART II.

THE MORAL DESIGN OF CATHOLIC UNITY.

CHAPTER I.

THE MORAL DESIGN OF THE CHURCH AS SHOWN BY HOLY SCRIPTURE.

INTRODUCTION.

In the foregoing part of this work I have brought forward the evidence to prove that God, by a direct act of revelation and appointment, has ordained one visible body, compacted into one visible form or polity, which is His Church. Thus far we have considered only the fact, and not the reason—only the positive appointment, and not the moral design of God. As we have therefore found external evidence to convince us that God has thus ordered His Church, the next step is for us to inquire *why* He has done so.

That all the works of God are pointed, by His perfect wisdom, at some aim, is an axiom as inseparable from the reason of man as the idea of God Himself. We need therefore only to inquire *what* is the aim or end of the Divine wisdom in the institution

of His Church. In seeking an answer to this question, it is plain that we are not at liberty to form to ourselves *à priori* conceptions of His design. We are so greatly ignorant of the intrinsic nature of the Divine Mind, of the extent of the causes which have brought mankind to their present state, of the condition of man as viewed in combination with the whole scheme of God's universe, of the laws and conditions which govern the invisible world, of the nature of evil, and death, and will, and of all other mysteries and realities which make up the constitution of man, and his relation to God, that we cannot, without presumption, venture upon a conjecture, antecedently to examining the express revelation of God, as to the final cause and great moral design of the particular mode in which He has been pleased to cast the economy of our redemption. This is not said as if any of the purposes of God could be for a moment opposed to the pure reason and conscience of His creatures. Let reason and conscience, unclouded by the passions, and the prejudice of a secret leaning, be fairly left to work, and they will be found to issue in a perfect harmony with the Mind from which they have their being. But there is no part of theology in which men are guilty of more unfairness than in the investigation of final causes. Minds at other times the most equitable are, in such examinations, found to be warped and biassed. Some early prejudice, some collateral effect, some foreseen conse-

quence from this or that particular opinion, or some contrariety to the preference of their own minds, will make them either wholly reject or even refuse to examine into the plainest appointment of God. "It is indeed a matter of great patience to reasonable men to find people arguing in this manner: objecting against the credibility of such particular things revealed in Scripture that they do not see the necessity or expediency of them. For though it is highly right, and the most pious exercise of our understanding, to inquire, with due reverence, into the ends and reasons of God's dispensations, yet, when these reasons are concealed, to argue from our ignorance, that such dispensations cannot be from God, is infinitely absurd. The presumption of this kind of objections seems almost lost in the folly of them; and the folly of them is yet greater when they are urged, as usually they are, against things in Christianity, analogous or like to those natural dispensations of Providence which are matter of experience. Let reason be kept to, and if any part of the Scripture account of the redemption of the world by Christ can be shown to be really contrary to it, let the Scripture, in the name of God, be given up; but let not such poor creatures as we go on objecting against an infinite scheme that we do not see the necessity or usefulness of all its parts, and call this reasoning."[1]

In seeking, then, for the great moral purposes

[1] Bishop Butler's Analogy, p. 311.

of God in the institution of His visible Church, we shall run the least risk of falling into the danger of private speculations if we keep ourselves exclusively to what God has Himself taught us of His own designs. We shall therefore take the grounds of our reasoning, in this chapter, from Holy Scripture alone.

1. And first, it is, on all hands, confessed that the final and highest end in which all the works and ways of God conspire and rest is His own glory. This we may learn of the heavenly hosts, whom the beloved disciple heard saying, "Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory, and honour, and power; for thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created."[1] But in speaking of God's glory we may more easily offend, with St. Peter on the Mount of Transfiguration, than speak aright; for "we wot not what to say." Nevertheless, what God has revealed of Himself we may with open face behold. The making, then, of this world was for His own glory. He had delight to project, as it were, the idea of His own wisdom before His holy sight; and out of the deep of His own Being to breathe the host of several beings which no eye but His may number. And as all was very good, so each several being, living or lifeless, was as a luminous point giving back the glory of the Eternal wisdom, and the whole universe of God as a mirror, faultless and blessed, on which the image of the Everlasting lay in a holy

[1] Rev. iv. 11.

rest. So the heavens declared God's glory, and the earth was filled with it, in the day when "the morning stars sung together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy."

And that which was the final end of God's almighty work in the making of the world is likewise His highest end in its redemption. For what is it but the making again of His first works out of the void and formless matter of a fallen world? And yet even so His work shall doubtless rise and terminate in an higher perfection than before. That the glory of God is the end and aim of man's redemption, Holy Scripture everywhere teaches; and this also the angelic song which was heard in heaven on the same night that the Saviour of man was born, when the multitude of the celestial choir sang glory to God in the highest, sufficiently declares. And we see this, too, in what His prophets and apostles have testified: as Isaiah that heard the seraphim, by the altar of sacrifice, cry, "Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of Hosts. The whole earth is full of His glory:"[1] and as the Lord Himself declared, "I am the Lord: that is my name: and my glory will I not give to another."[2] And of the gathering of His redeemed people we read, "I am the Lord thy God, the Holy One of Israel, thy Saviour: I gave Egypt for thy ransom, Ethiopia and Seba for thee. . . . . Fear not, for I am with thee: I will bring thy seed from the east, and gather thee from the west: I will

[1] Isaiah vi. 3. [2] Isaiah xlii. 7.

say to the north, Give up; and to the south, Keep not back: bring my sons from far, and my daughters from the ends of the earth; even every one that is called by my name, for I have created him for my glory."[1] And in like manner the apostles teach us that we were "chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before Him in love: having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to Himself, according to the good pleasure of His will, to the praise of the glory of His grace."[2] That in Christ all the promises of God "are yea, and in Him Amen, unto the glory of God by us."[3] "For God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ."[4] "And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us; and we beheld His glory, the glory as of the Only Begotten of the Father."[5] And this glory was not manifested to us only, but the whole working out "of the mystery which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who hath created all things by Jesus Christ," was foreordained "to the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the Church the manifold wisdom of God."[6] Even they who by the

[1] Isaiah xliii. 3, 5, 6, 7. [2] Eph. i. 4, 5, 6.
[3] 2 Cor. i. 20. [4] 2 Cor. iv. 6. [5] St. John i. 14.
[6] Eph. iii. 9, 10.

most direct intuition see the brightness of the Everlasting, have ever more and more of a deeper lore to learn by the evolving characters of God's mysterious hand. The Church, even to angels, is the book of God's wisdom, and the mirror of His glory. It must further be noted that this final end of God's works and ways is nevertheless so nigh to every redeemed man as to be also the final end of all his actions. "Ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's,"[1] "Whether therefore ye eat, or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God."[2]

It is not, however, necessary to multiply proofs of a point which no man is concerned to deny. It is evident not only from revelation but from natural reason, and the testimony of conscience, that all God's works and ways, in creation and redemption, in mercy and in power, and all His mysterious economy with His Church and people, by the ministry of apostles, and prophets, and angels, and of His only begotten Son, all begin and end, as a circle returns into itself, in His own incommunicable glory. This then is the chiefest and highest final cause of all.

2. But there are also ends subordinate, and mediate to the highest and last of all; and these too we must touch on.

The first and necessary means to the manifestation of God's glory is the manifestation of His na-

[1] 1 Cor. vi. 20. [2] 1 Cor. x. 31.

ture and character. We may say that the chief among subordinate ends to which all the works and ways of God in the redemption of mankind have been directed is the restoration of a true knowledge of Himself; or, in other words, the chief end of the Church is the restoration to the world of a true knowledge of God. This is so evident throughout the whole of Scripture as to need no proof. From the beginning of the positive institution of His Church, the foundation-stone has been, "Hear, O Israel: the Lord our God is one Lord;"[1] and the first of His commandments, "I am the Lord thy God; thou shalt have no other gods before me:"[2] and so highly did God esteem of this chief doctrine of His Church, that He fenced it with the most fearful of all His warnings: "The Lord thy God is a consuming fire, even a jealous God."[3] This was the rock of the elder, as the Sonship of Christ is of the later, Church. So St. Paul teaches us that the wickedness of man lay in this: "Because that when they knew God they glorified Him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened: professing themselves to be wise, they became fools; and changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and to four-footed beasts and creeping things. Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness, through the lusts of

[1] Deut. vi. 4. [2] Exod. xx. 2, 3. [3] Deut. iv. 24.

their own hearts, to dishonour their own bodies between themselves: who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator who is blessed for ever. Amen."[1] "After that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God; it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe:"[2] as also St. Paul said at Athens, "As I passed by and beheld your devotions, I found an altar, with this inscription, 'To the unknown God.' Whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, Him declare I unto you."[3] We have here in the person of St. Paul, as it were, a symbol of God's Church in the world, its mission, and its message. Let this suffice for the Scriptural proof that the restoration of the true knowledge of God to the world is the chief of all the subordinate ends of the Church.

3. The next end of the institution of the Church is the restoration of man to the image of God. If it should seem that this end ought to have been placed before the last, I must beg the reader to consider the following points. First, that the restoration of the true knowledge of God is a means to the restoration of man to his image. And next, that whatsoever be the event of this revelation of Himself to His creatures, His name shall be glorified. The glory of the Lord was in the pillar which stood between the hosts, although the Egyptians were overwhelmed in the sea, and the Israelites fell in

[1] Rom. i. 20, 25. [2] 1 Cor. i. 21. [3] Acts xvii. 23.

the wilderness. St. Paul also says, "Thanks be unto God, which always causeth us to triumph in Christ; and maketh manifest the savour of His knowledge to us in every place. We are unto God a sweet savour of Christ in them that are saved and in them that perish. To the one we are the savour of death unto death, and to the other the savour of life unto life."[1] The restoration of the true knowledge of God is an end broader, and higher, and deeper than the salvation of Saints: for it is also the condemnation of the ungodly, and the light which for judgment has entered into the whole world.[2] And, lastly, we do not know what purpose of God it may fulfil in the transcendent system of His creatures, of which our world is but a part.

The great mystery of man's restoration to the image of God, like the mystery of his fall, runs through the whole of Scripture. It is more than stated; it is assumed everywhere; it is one of the great moral axioms on which all the word of God is based. Sayings, at first sight remote, will be found to be full of it. "God created man in His own image; in the image of God created He him."[3] "How can he be clean that is born of a woman?"[4] "I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me."[5] Our Lord declared it when He said "I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly."[6] And St.

[1] 2 Cor. ii. 15, 16. [2] St. John iii. 19, 20, 21.
[3] Gen. i. 27. [4] Job xxv. 4, 5. [5] Ps. li. 5. [6] St. John x. 10.

John: "Now are we the sons of God; and it doth not yet appear what we shall be, but we know that when he shall appear we shall be like Him, for we shall see him as He is."[1] And St. Paul: "We all with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory as by the spirit of the Lord."[2] He "shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto His glorious body."[3] "By man came death; by man came also the resurrection of the dead: as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive."[4] "It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption: it is sown in dishonour, it is raised in glory: it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power: it is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body. And so it is written, the first man Adam was made a living soul, the last Adam was made a quickening spirit. The first man is of the earth earthy: the second man is the Lord from heaven. As is the earthy such are they that are earthy, and as is the heavenly such are they also that are heavenly; and as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly."[5] "Whom he did foreknow he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his son."[6] "The earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God. For the creature was

[1] St. John, 1st Ep. iii. 2. [2] 2 Cor. iii. 18.
[3] Phil. iii. 21. [4] 1 Cor. xv. 21, 22. [5] 1 Cor. xv. 42—49.
[6] Rom. viii. 29.

made subject to vanity not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope. Because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God. For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now. And not only they, but ourselves also, which have the first fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit the redemption of our body." [1] For he hath made us "partakers of the Divine nature;" [2] and "the righteous shall shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father." [3] The regeneration [4] therefore of all His works, the reconstituting of all things under a new head: [5] that is to say, the perfection of His creature, the restoration of man in body, soul, and spirit to the image of God, in which he was made at the beginning, is another subordinate end in the series of final causes for which his Church was ordained.

4. But there is also another still more proximate to us; and that is the probation of man's moral nature. It is not simply the restoration of man to the image of God, but his restoration under a certain law and condition that God has willed. The frame of this visible world shall melt with fervent heat, and we know not whether or no the Everlasting may be pleased to recast its fused elements into a

[1] Rom. viii. 19, 23. [2] 2 Pet. i. 4.
[3] St. Matth. xiii. 43. [4] St. Matthew. [5] Ephes. i. 10.

holy Paradise. But the nature of man is otherwise. God has made him in His own image. He is lord of all the creatures of God, not so much by his reason, as by his will. The mystery of moral choice and self-determination is that which is most truly Godlike in man. It is a pregnant sign of man's fall that we should distinguish from each other these transcribed features of the one Divine image—between the intelligential and elective energies of our spiritual being. But of this we shall have to speak more hereafter. It was by the will man fell, and through the will he must be raised again. Such is his Maker's law; and in the reclaiming of man to Himself, He works through the manifold actings of volition, and resolution, and moral strife, and the strength of self-affirming will. He ordains that man should overcome evil by his own choice; that he should deliberately refuse to unite with the powers that are antagonist to God. The existence of evil in the universe of God can be solved only by the freedom of man's will, or by the Manichæan heresy of two principles. The restoration of man, though wrought by God, is made, by the participation of a reclaimed will, to be also the work of each restored man. His restoration is the free and conscious fixing of his choice on God.

Now it is certain that every living man has in himself a witness to the great law of moral trial: he is as conscious of the freedom of his will as he is of his very life. Apart from Revelation, we have

more direct intuitive evidence of the freedom of our will than of the existence of God; and if we take in the witness of Revelation, both these primary truths are alike declared.

The condition of man in Paradise: the warning to Noah of things not seen as yet: the whole life of Abraham, above all in the sacrifice of his son: the whole economy ordained by God through Moses; the very idea of sacrifices and a priesthood, of types and adumbrations, all alike prove that God deals with man as a free and responsible being placed here upon a great moral trial. We need do no more than quote one of many like sayings of God to his people of old:—"See, I have set before thee this day life and good, death and evil. . . . . I call heaven and earth to record this day against you that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing: therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live."[1]

We may take a further illustration of the peculiar nature of man's probation from two or three remarkable passages in Holy Scripture: as, for instance, we read of the prophet that went to denounce King Ahab as follows:—"A certain man of the sons of the prophets said unto his neighbour in the word of the Lord, Smite me, I pray thee; and the man refused to smite him. Then said he unto him, Because thou hast not obeyed the voice of the Lord, behold, as soon as thou hast departed

[1] Deut. xxx. 15, 18.

from me, a lion shall slay thee. And as soon as he was departed from him, a lion found him and slew him."[1] Here was a probation and its award. So again in the case of the disobedient prophet seduced by the old prophet in Bethel. And so likewise the way in which Naaman was proved before he was cleansed; and so also in the probation of Joash, king of Israel. "Now Elisha was fallen sick of the sickness whereof he died; and Joash, the king of Israel, came down unto him, and wept on his face, and said, O my father, my father, the chariot of Israel and the horsemen thereof. And Elisha said unto him, Take bow and arrows; and he took unto him bow and arrows. And he said to the king of Israel, Put thine hand upon the bow; and he put his hand upon it. And Elisha put his hands upon the king's hands, and he said, Open the window eastward; and he opened it. Then Elisha said, Shoot; and he shot; and he said, The arrow of the Lord's deliverance, and the arrow of deliverance from Syria: for thou shalt smite the Syrians in Aphek till thou have consumed them. And he said, Take the arrows; and he took them. And he said unto the King of Israel, Smite upon the ground; and he smote thrice and stayed. And the man of God was wroth with him, and said, Thou shouldest have smitten five or six times: thou hadst then smitten Syria till thou hadst consumed it, whereas now thou shalt smite Syria but thrice."[2] Now in

[1] 1 Kings xx. 35, 36. [2] 2 Kings xiii. 14—19.

all these places we see a free moral agent put on his probation by the secret wisdom of God: we see great results suspended upon slight and unlikely conditions; and this is the nature of the life of faith. The word and sacraments of Christ are addressed to the same principle of the heart of man. It is through a probation of the will and moral choice that God blesses us, and by blessing restores man to His favour and to His own image. And as He did of old, so does He now try His people. "All the commandments which I command thee this day shall ye observe to do, that ye may live and multiply, and go in and possess the land which the Lord sware unto your fathers. And thou shalt remember all the way which the Lord thy God led thee these forty years in the wilderness to humble thee, and to prove thee, to know what was in thine heart, whether thou wouldst keep his commandments or no. And he humbled thee, and suffered thee to hunger, and fed thee with manna, which thou knewest not; neither did thy fathers know, that he might make thee know that man doth not live by bread only, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord doth man live;" or, in other words, that he walks by faith. From all that has been said we see that the restoration of man to God's image is a moral work wrought through a moral probation. And it is with a purpose of putting man on this trial that God has shaped all His positive appointments in the

economy of redemption. This, therefore, is another, and, as regards ourselves, the immediate end of the institution of the Church.

We may now sum up this present chapter.

We have seen, then, from Holy Scripture that the highest and final cause of all the works and ways of God, both in creating and restoring the world, is His own incommunicable glory; and that, as *means*, if taken in order to this end, or as subordinate *ends*, if taken by themselves, He has ordered His appointments so as to restore to the world a true knowledge of Himself, to restore mankind to the image of God, and to put man upon a probation of his moral nature; and that the positive appointment or form in which he has provided for the accomplishment of these ends is His Church. We have, therefore, arrived at an outline of His moral design in constituting this visible body in the earth. The next point to be inquired is, how the *unity* of that visible body is subservient to the great moral design which we have here ascertained. And this we may consider in the next chapter.

CHAPTER II.

THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH A MEANS TO RESTORE THE TRUE KNOWLEDGE OF GOD.

We have now seen what are the final causes or ends for which God has been pleased to ordain His Church; and it follows that we should now examine in what way the *unity* of the Church is subservient to His design.

And, first, as to the highest end of all, which is His own glory. It is not necessary that we should adduce further proof, for it will be enough to show the relation of cause and consequence subsisting between the Unity of the Church, and the subordinate ends, which in themselves are the conditions of the highest.

The point, therefore, to be considered is, how the Unity of the Church subserves the purpose of God in restoring a right knowledge of Himself to the world. And it seems self-evident that the property of Unity is that aspect of the Church, so to speak,

which is divinely ordained to witness to the Unity of God.

And this it does, first, in the way of symbol. The Church is the type or representative of the one God.

We shall the better understand this, if we consider the antagonist error with which it was designed to contend. It is evident that mankind possessed in the beginning a true knowledge of the Divine nature. Whether or no before the flood men fell into Polytheism, we have no proof from Holy Scripture. It was a tradition among the Jews that the first declension to this error was as old as the days of Enoch. A Jewish writer says, "In the days of Enoch the sons of men grievously erred, and the wise men of that age became brutish (even Enoch himself being in the number of them); and their error was this, that since God had created the stars and spheres to govern the world, and placing them on high had bestowed this honour on them, that they should be His ministers and subservient instruments, men ought, therefore, to praise them, honour them, and worship them."[1]

The earliest record of idolatry in Scripture is after the flood, namely, that of Abraham's family, from which God called him out.[2] And this is shown, also, by the Teraphim which were taken from La-

[1] Maimonides, quoted by Cudworth, Intellectual System, p. 467, ed. 1678. See Ecclus. xliv. 16.

[2] Joshua xxiv. 2.

ban by Rachel.[1] It is plain, also, that idolatry had already become dominant among the nations of Canaan. It has been much controverted, from very early times, whether Polytheism and idolatry had their rise in Egypt or in Chaldæa. The balance of likelihood seems to incline towards the former,[2] which well agrees with the dim and unsearchable antiquity of the Egyptian empire. But howsoever this may be, as a matter of history, there are certain ideal epochs which may be safely assumed. As, first, it is evident that in the beginning all mankind knew, by the transmitted light of the original Revelation, the true nature of God. This holds equally true of the first generation after Adam and after Noah. The Holy Scripture teaches us that the first step to Polytheism was an apostacy, or declension of the moral nature from God. "They liked not to retain God in their knowledge." The fear and the lust, which sprang from sin, first loosened the moral hold which the heart had of God, and then drew a cloud over the intellectual sight of man. He had lost the idea of purity and truth, and the holiness of God was as an unintelligible character. It was visible, but unintelligible. He had lost the key, and he could not read it. And this readily explains the strange forgetfulness which seemed to blot the image of God from man's heart. The mind of man cannot long remember anything that it does not either understand or love. Man had

[1] Genesis xxxi. 19. [2] Cudworth, Int. Syst. pp. 308, 309.

lost both these holds on the knowledge of God. The creatures of the visible world ceased to be relative symbols: they became absolute beings; and men worshipped the hieroglyphic forms when they had lost their meaning. Again, with the right knowledge of God they forfeited also the consciousness of His presence: yet they could not be unconscious of the powers of Nature. These were present, working upon them, ministering to them, baffling them, controlling them; and to these they bowed down and worshipped. The ministries and energies of nature were severed, and impersonated, and projected before the mind as beings higher than man.[1] And hence came Polytheism, which was the elder brother of idolatry. The same ideal process elevated to the rank of gods the passions and affections of the human soul: they were motive powers, ever present in all places and to all men, calming the human heart or lashing it into a storm, according to an universal law. The universality and the power of their own mysterious nature men took for gods external to themselves. From the same law of the mind, which worshipped all that had power over itself, came also the deifying of men. All who, by wisdom or power, governed their fellow-men—all who, in the arts of life, had arisen as great benefactors of mankind—the founders of empires, and the master-minds that sketched out the first platforms of civil polity,—were by an

[1] Cudworth, p. 229.

over-awed and grateful recollection invested with accumulated honours, and inscribed among the gods. It is evident that minds of a higher than common power wrought up into system, and impressed a form upon the rude materials of popular misbelief: a strong process of abstraction and a deep mystical import are found running through the Pagan Polytheism. It was philosophical as well as fabulous. And this was the work of higher minds pondering upon the imaginations of other men, and, by a reflex act, upon their own. Idolatry is a further step, being a clothing of gross and visible forms thrown over the abstractions which have otherwise no representative or symbol. I have dwelt the longer on this point because it would seem that even the Pagan world did not altogether lose the idea of one only supreme God. The deities of Polytheism were subordinate, finite, and created. There was still retained the idea of a monarchy over gods and men, vested in one who was the Ruler of all, and in some sort acknowledged as the one supreme God. It may be indeed true that, among the multitude of grosser and darker minds, many may have risen no higher than the visible forms of their idolatry, and others only so far as to apprehend the existence of finite beings, to whom the sensible idols were as a material clothing; and this, because to a finite mind the thought of infinity is strange and burdensome. So Pliny explains it—"Frail and wearied mortality, mindful of its own infirmity, has thus crum-

bled (the deity) into fragments, that every one might worship those portions he stood most in need of."[1] It would nevertheless appear that the reason of mankind in all ages has tended again towards a belief in one supreme, uncreated God, the maker and governor of all, both gods and men: I say tended towards the belief, because it was plainly no more than an approximation to the truth which nothing but a revelation from God could restore to the world. If we examine the language of the most enlightened, and that in times when the doctrine of the Divine Unity, intrusted to the Jewish Church, may be supposed to have affected the course of thought even in the Gentile schools,[2] we shall still perceive the truth of the Apostle's words, that "the world by wisdom knew not God." In the Philosophical Schools, the One Supreme God is "called ὁ Δημιουργὸς, the Opifex, architect and maker of the world; ὁ Ἡγεμὼν τοῦ παντὸς καὶ Ἀρχηγέτης, the prince and chief ruler of the universe; ὁ πρῶτος καὶ ὁ Πρωτίστος Θεὸς by the Greeks; and by the Latins, Primus Deus, the first God: ὁ πρῶτος νοῦς, the first Mind; ὁ Μέγας Θεὸς, the great God; ὁ Μέγιστος Δαίμων and ὁ μέγιστος Θεῶν, the greatest God and the greatest of the Gods; ὁ Ὕψιστος, the highest, and ὁ ὕπατος Θεῶν, the supreme of the Gods; ὁ ἀνωτάτω Θεὸς, the uppermost, or most transcendent God; Princeps ille Deus, that chief or principal God; Θεὸς Θεῶν, the God of Gods; and Ἀρχὴ ἀρχῶν, the principle of

[1] See Reeves's Apologies, Note, vol. ii. p. 100.

[2] Gale's Court of the Gentiles, part ii. b. 2, c. 8.

principles; *το πρῶτον αἴτιον*, the first cause; *ὁ τόδε τῶ πᾶν γεννήσας*, He that generated or created this whole universe; *ὁ Κρατέων τοῦ παντὸς*, He that ruleth over the whole world; Summus Rector et Dominus, the supreme Governor and Lord of all; *ὁ ἐπὶ πασι Θεὸς*, the God over all; *ὁ Θεὸς ἀγεννητὸς, αὐτογενὴς, αὐτοφυὴς, ἀυθυπόστατος*, the Ingenerate, or unmade, self-originated and self-subsisting Deity; *Μονὰς*, a Monad; *τῶ ἕν καὶ αὐτοἀγαθον*, Unity and Goodness itself; *τὸ ἐπέκεινα τῆς ὐσίας* and *τὸ ὑπερούσιον*, that which is above essence, or superessential; *τὸ ἐπέκεινα νοῦ*, that which is above mind and understanding; Summum illud et æternum, neque mutabile neque interiturum, that supreme and eternal Being which is immutable and can never perish; *Ἀρχὴ, καὶ τέλος, καὶ μέσον, ἀπάντων*, the Beginning, and End, and Middle of all things; *Ἕν καὶ πάντα*, One and all things; Deus unus et omnes, One God and all Gods. And lastly, to name no more, *ἡ Πρόνοια*, or Providence as distinguished from *Φυσις*, Nature."[1] And this has been declared by some to be the tone of all Pagans, that there was "One God, the King and Father of all, and many gods, the sons of God, reigning together with God."[2]

It may not be amiss to throw together in a summary way the views which have been entertained respecting the character and intent of the Gentile Polytheism: we shall then more clearly see to what particular points the testimony of the Church is directed.

[1] Cudworth, Intell. System, pp. 264, 265.
[2] Cudworth, p. 234.

And, first, it is remarkable that we find Hebrew writers, who, it might be thought, would be most exact in a point which constituted the broad characteristic difference between the faith of Israel and the false religion of the Gentile world, adopting a view more favourable than the facts of primitive history would seem to warrant.

Maimonides, in the twelfth century, writes of the Gentile idolatry as follows:—"The foundation of that commandment against strange worship is this, that no man should worship any of the creatures whatsoever, neither angel, nor sphere, nor star, nor any of the four elements, nor anything made out of them: for though he that worships these things knows that the Lord is God, and superior to them all, and worships these creatures no otherwise than Enoch and the rest of that age did, yet is he nevertheless guilty of strange worship and idolatry."[1] In this and in the following passages, it is asserted that these created beings were worshipped by them only as ministers of God's Providence, and mediators between them and Him. "You know that whosoever committeth idolatry, he doth it not as supposing that there is no other God besides that which he worshippeth, for it never came into the minds of any idolaters, nor ever will, that the statue which is made by them of metal, or stone, or wood, is that very God who created heaven and earth; but they worship these statues and images only as the representation of

[1] Cudworth, Int. Syst. p. 468.

something which is a mediator between God and them." [1] And, in another place, "The idolaters first argued thus in respect of God: that since He was of such transcendent perfection above men, it was not possible for men to be united to or to have communion with Him, otherwise than by certain middle beings or mediators, as it is the manner of earthly kings to have petitions conveyed to them by the hands of mediators and intercessors. Secondly, they thus argued also in respect of themselves: that being corporeal, so that they could not apprehend God abstractedly, they must needs have something sensible to excite and stir up their devotion, and to fix their imagination upon." [2] And in the same way another Jewish writer explains the idolatry of Ahab and other kings of Israel and Judah. They "erred in worshipping the stars on these two accounts mentioned by Maimonides, notwithstanding that they believed the existence of God and His Unity; they partly conceiving that they should honour God in worshipping His ministers, and partly worshipping them as mediators betwixt God and themselves." [3]

And in like manner he explains the First Commandment. "Thou shalt not set up other inferior gods as mediators betwixt me and thyself, or worship them, so as thinking to honour me thereby." [4] These Hebrew writers reduce the Gentile Polytheism and idolatry to these three heads:—First, the wor-

[1] Cudworth, Int. Syst. p. 468. [2] Ib. [3] Ib. p. 469. [4] Ib.

shipping the ministers of God, as thinking to honour Him thereby. Secondly, the worshipping them as intercessors with God. And lastly, the worshipping of material representations or memorials of God. And this view may be gathered also from incidental notices scattered through their other writings. Maimonides, expounding Jeremiah xi. 7, says, "As if he should say, all the Gentiles knew that Thou art the only Supreme God, but their error and folly consists in this—that they think their vanity of worshipping inferior gods to be a thing agreeable to Thy will."[1] And so Kimchi writes, "Neither do they worship the stars otherwise than as mediators betwixt Thee and them. These wise men know that an idol is nothing; and though they worship stars, yet do they worship them as Thy ministers, and that they may be intercessors for them."[2] And again on Malachi i. 11: "Although the Pagans worshipped the Host of Heaven, yet do they confess Me to be the first cause, they worshipping them only as in their opinion certain mediators betwixt Me and them."[3]

We may now take the testimony of Christian writers; and first that of the Apostle St. Paul. In writing to the Romans, he charges the Gentiles with "holding the truth in unrighteousness." The knowledge of the one God, such as they still had, they held in the bondage of their impure and darkened hearts. He then says, "They liked not

[1] Cudworth, Int. Syst. p. 470. [2] Ib. [3] Ib.

to retain God in their knowledge" (ἐν ἐπίγνωσει), that is in an habitual, and conscious, or practical—*i. e.* a moral knowledge. Wherefore, in the same chapter, he acknowledges them to possess a knowledge of some sort. "Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them, for God hath showed it unto them:" (Τὸ γνωστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ φανερόν ἐστιν ἐν αὐτοῖς· ὁ γὰρ Θεὸς αὐτοῖς ἐφανέρωσε)—that is, His eternal power and Godhead manifested in His created works. They had as it were a natural, as distinguished from a moral knowledge of him. Therefore "they glorified Him not as God," of which adoration the moral knowledge is a necessary condition: "neither were they thankful." And they fell even to worshipping the works of His hands; and "they worshipped and served the creature (either *besides*, *i. e.* in addition to, or *beyond*) more than the Creator." Both these senses ultimately run up into one. They multiplied the objects of worship, and gave to each several god a portion of that which is wholly due to the one true God alone. And this seems plainly the meaning of St. Paul at Athens, where he charges them with being "too superstitious," or rather "more than commonly devout:"[1] the excess of this devotion terminating on objects below the one true God.

The uninspired writers of the Church seem to adopt the views of the philosophical schools: of many

[1] For the correctness of this interpretation, see Cudworth, Int. Syst. p. 471—474.

passages, we may take the following:—Clement of Alexandria says, "But that the chief men among the Greeks know God, not according to knowledge (*οὐ κατ' ἐπίγνωσιν*), but according to an indirect manifestation, St. Peter declares in his Predication, 'Ye know, therefore, that there is one God who made the beginning of all things, and has power over the end: And the Invisible, who seeth all things, who cannot be contained of any, but containeth all things, &c. Himself uncreate, who created all things by the word of His power, that is, according to the mystical sense of Scripture, by His Son.' Then he adds, 'Worship ye this God, not as the Greeks do,' as signifying that the chief of the Greeks worship the same God as we, but not according to the perfect knowledge (*οὗ κατ' ἐπίγνωσιν παντελῆ*) which they have who have learned by the tradition of the Son. He does not say, 'Worship not the God whom the Greeks worship, but, Worship Him not as the Greeks do: changing the mode of the worship of God, not preaching another God.' What this—'not as the Greeks do'—signifies, Peter himself will make plain, adding, 'Because being carried away by ignorance, and not knowing God as one acccording to the perfect knowledge, they forming into shapes those things over which he had given them the power of use, namely, wood and stones, brass and iron, gold and silver . . . . do worship them.'" Clement adds, "He dispensed unto us a New Covenant. For the Covenants of the Greeks and of the Jews are old. Ye who, in third place, wor-

ship God after a new manner are Christians. For he clearly showed, I conceive, that the one and only God was known by the Greeks after a Gentile manner, by the Jews after a Jewish, but by us in a new and spiritual way. Moreover, he shows that the same God is the giver of both the Covenants, who was also the giver of the Greek philosophy to the Greeks, through which the Almighty is glorified by the Greeks."[1] Lactantius, also writing against Polytheism, says, "They affirm these gods of theirs so to preside over the several parts of the world, as that there is only one chief rector or governor: likewise it follows that all their other gods can be nothing else than ministers and officers which the one greatest God who is omnipotent hath variously appointed and constituted, so as to serve His command and nod."[2] So also Eusebius gives the following account of the Pagan system:—"The Pagans declare themselves in this manner, that there is one God, who with His various powers filleth all things, and passeth through all things, and presideth over all things, but being incorporeally and invisibly present in all things, and pervading them, he is reasonably worshipped by or in those things that are manifest and visible."[3] St. Augustin, in his writings against Faustus the Manichæan, who had objected to the Christians that they had borrowed the doctrine of this sole government of one God from the Pagans, says,

[1] S. Clem. Alex. Strom. vi. 635.
[2] Cudworth, Int. Syst. p. 279. [3] Ib. p. 280.

"Let Faustus therefore learn, or rather they who are delighted with his writings, that we have not received the belief of God's sole government from the Gentiles, but that the Gentiles were not so far fallen to false gods as to lose the belief of one true God, by whom all nations of whatsoever kind exist." [1] He then quotes the words of St. Paul to the Romans, already cited. We may now take the testimony of one or two of the later Pagans. It is not unreasonable to believe that as the truths of the Gospel prevailed, they so far yielded to the pressure of Christianity as to throw their Polytheism into a more abstract and subtler shape. We find them holding the same language as Maimonides and Clement of Alexandria. Celsus speaks frequently of one Supreme God whom he calls the first God (*τὸν πρῶτον Θεὸν*), the greatest God (*τὸν μεγιστὸν Θεὸν*), the super-celestial God (*τὸν ὑπερούρανιον Θεὸν*), and the like. [2] In the same language Porphyry asserted one Supreme Deity, and one only, unmade, and self-existent (*ἀγέννητον*) principle of all things. [3] The Emperor Julian, in like manner, after asserting that there is one common Father and King over all, but that the tutelage of particular regions is assigned to inferior deities, says: "Whereas in the common Father all things are perfect, and one in all; in the particular or partial deities, one excels in one power, another in another." [4]

[1] S. Aug. contra Faust. lib. xx. c. 19.
[2] Cudworth, Int. Syst. p. 270. [3] Ib. p. 271. [4] Ib. p. 274.

In exactly the same tone the philosophers and learned men among the Pagans, after the time of Constantine and in the decline of their system, such as Iamblichus, Syrianus, Proclus, Simplicius, and many others, clearly acknowledged one Supreme God as the first cause of all things. I will give one more passage from the letter of Maximus of Madaura to St. Augustin :—" Forsooth, that there is one God supreme, without beginning, without offspring, the Father, so to speak, of Nature, great and wonderful, who is there so beside himself, so diseased in mind, as to deny to be a most certain truth? It is His energies diffused throughout the world that we invoke with many names, forasmuch as we all of us are ignorant of His own proper name. For 'God' is a name common to all religions; and so it is, that whilst we address as it were His members severally with various supplications, we evidently may be seen to worship the whole." [1]

The many philosophical theories respecting the one first cause, the Maker and Governor of the world, may be reduced at last to two: One, that the Divine Being was diffused throughout the world as a quickening soul, which is Pantheism: The other, that He was a Spiritual Being, superior to the world which He had created. According to the first theory, the visible things of creation were manifestations of Himself. According to the second, they were only His

[1] S. Aug. ii. 20.

ministers. There remains a still further refinement of this latter opinion to be noticed. There were some who taught that the visible creatures were worthy to be worshipped only as the expressions of ideas, or patterns in the Divine mind. They taught that in God there exists an archetypal world, of which this material world is only the representative. They contended, therefore, that their worship was paid, not to the sensible objects, but to the Divine ideas which are in the mind of God Himself. This was held by the Emperor Julian, who says, "Plato, indeed, speaketh of certain visible gods, the sun and the moon, and the stars, and the heavens; but these are all but the images of other invisible gods: that visible sun which we see with our eyes is but an image of another intelligible and invisible one, (*τοῦ νοητοῦ καὶ μὴ φαινομένου,*) so likewise the visible moon and every one of the stars are but the images and resemblances of another moon and of other intelligible stars. Wherefore Plato acknowledged also these other invisible gods inexisting and co-existing with the Demiurgus from whom they were generated and produced."[1] It is evident also from Philo that this notion was not peculiar to the Platonizing pagans of the later times,[2] but had been known long before.

To so high a point did some of the Greek philosophers carry their theology, that we may find apparent adumbrations of a Trinity in the Unity

[1] Cudworth, Int. Syst. p. 499. [2] Ib. p. 501.

of the Godhead: I say adumbrations, designing to express a general and inexact shadowing out of the true doctrine.

In the arcana of the antient Greek philosophy there existed a doctrine concerning a Divine Triad. We find one speaking of three Divine Hypostases (*τρεῖς ἀρχὰι καὶ ὑποστάσεις, i. e. τὸ ἀγάθον*, or *ἕν, νοῦς, ψύχη*), or Monad, mind and soul; and affirming this to be no new doctrine. "That these doctrines," he says, "are not new, nor of yesterday, but have been very antiently delivered, though obscurely (the discourses now extant being but explications of them), appears from Plato's own writings, Parmenides before him having insisted on them."[1]

The Triad of Parmenides is thus expressed by Plotinus:—"Parmenides in Plato, speaking now exactly, distinguishes three Divine Unities subordinate: the first, of that which is perfectly and most properly one (*τὸ πρῶτον ἕν*); the second, of that which was called by him One-many (*ἕν πολλὰ*); the third, of that which is thus expressed, one and many (*ἕν καὶ πολλὰ*)."[2] The Platonic Triad consisted of goodness (*τὸ ἄγαθον*), wisdom (*λόγος, σοφία, νοῦς*), and life, power, and action (*ψύχη*); and these he taught were absolutely one being, each comprehended in the others; all being self-existent and eternal, three Hypostases in one Divine nature.[3]

[1] Ptolemus, quoted by Cudworth, Int. Syst. p. 546.
[2] Ib. pp. 386, 387.
[3] Ib. pp. 572, 573, 576, 577, 578.

Numenius, who was a later Pythagorean, held the same tenet as a part of the system of Pythagoras; and Moderatus affirms this Trinity of principles to be one of the Pythagorean Cabala: Iamblichus also says, "That there were three gods praised by the Pythagoreans."[1] It has been thought that the Pythagorean theology was derived from the Orphic; that Orpheus was only the promulgator of a still more ancient tenet; and that Orpheus, Pythagoras, and Plato, who all alike held a Divine Triad, had been initiated into the theology of the Egyptians: from which it has been supposed that this was an article of their arcana or Esoteric theology. Be this as it may, there are some traces of a Trinity in the Mithraic mysteries derived by the Persians from Zoroaster; in the Chaldean oracles of the Magi, and in the Samothracian doctrines; and, lastly, the Ternary or Triad, was a number generally regarded by the Greeks and Pagans as containing some mystery in nature, and was, therefore, used in their religious rites. Aristotle says, "Wherefore from nature, and as it were observing her laws, have we taken this number of three, making use of the same in the sacrifices of the gods and other purifications."[2]

It seems then, first, that a belief in One Supreme God, invisible, alone uncreated, the Governor of all, was not altogether lost.

[1] Cudworth, Int. Syst. p. 547.
[2] Ib. p. 547. Arist. de Cœlo, l. i. c. 5.

Secondly, that a multitude of subordinate, finite, generated, and visible deities was both acknowledged and worshipped either as distinct gods, or as ministers and mediators between man and the Supreme God.

Thirdly, that a doctrine concerning a Divine Triad was held, and transmitted through the secret theologies and philosophical schools.

But it must be observed that their purest doctrine of the Divine unity was held to be consistent with a belief in, and a worship of, many gods. It taught no moral relations nor particular providence of love and mercy.[1]

We may now go on to examine how the Church is so constituted, in the particular property of its Unity, as to restore the true knowledge of God in the world.

And, first, by the objective Unity of the Faith the Church has taken up all philosophies and consolidated them in one. Whether by the momentum of an original revelation, or by the continual guidance of a heavenly teaching, or by the natural convergence of the reason of man towards the unseen realities of truth, it is most certain that all thoughtful and purer minds were gazing one way: as the fulness of time drew on, their eyes were more and more intently fixed on one point in the horizon, "more than they that watch for the morning;"

[1] Mill on the Pantheistic Theory, p. 1; and Notices of the Mosaic Law by H. J. Rose, pp. 25 and 83, 84.

and all the lights of this fallen world were bent towards one central region, in which at last they met and kindled. The one Faith was the focus of all philosophies, in which they were fused, purified, and blended. The Monad and the Triad were transfigured into Three Persons in One God. The subordination of the Platonic Triad was verified in the ministrative offices of the Son and the Holy Ghost. The eternity, the uncreated substance, the infinity of goodness, wisdom, and power, the transcendent majesty, the true personality, and the moral providence of the One Supreme Maker and Ruler of the World, was affirmed from heaven. The scattered truths which had wandered up and down the earth, and had been in part adored, and in part held in unrighteousness, were now elected and called home, and as it were regenerated, and gathered into one blessed company, and glorified once more as the witnesses of the Eternal.

God was manifested as the life of the world, and yet not so as to be one with the world; but as distinct, yet filling all things. God was manifested as the source of life to man. The affinity of the soul of man to God was revealed; and the actual participation of man, through the gift of grace, in the Divine nature, and yet not so as to extinguish the distinct and immortal being of each individual soul.

In thus taking up into itself all the scattered family of truth, the one Faith abolished all the intermingling falsehoods of four thousand years.

Therefore it follows, as a just corollary, that in affirming the unity and sovereignty of God, it annihilated the whole system of many subordinate deities. It declared absolutely that there is no God but One; that all created being is generically distinct, and has in it no divine prerogative. It taught mankind that the wisest and the best of earth pass not the bounds of man's nature; that the passions and energies of mankind are, by God's ordinance, parts of man's own being; that they are not his lords, but themselves subject to his control; that the powers of nature are no gods, but pressures of the one Almighty Hand; and that the visible works of God are fellow-creatures with man, and put under his feet.

And, as a second corollary, it follows that the One Faith, in restricting the Divine nature, restricts also all worship to the One Supreme God.

Josephus says that Abraham was "the first that ventured to publish this notion, that there was but one God, the Creator of the Universe; and that as to other [gods], if they contributed anything to the happiness of men, that each of them afforded it only according to his appointment, and not by their own power." He adds: "So far as they co-operate to our advantage, they do it not of their own abilities, but as they are subservient to Him that commands them, to whom alone we ought justly to offer our honour and thanksgiving."[1] Now, it is to be observed that, in the above passage, the ministrative office of intermediate divinities is supposed as hypo-

[1] Josephus, lib. i. vii.

thetically possible; but, nevertheless, the great law of worship is restricted to God alone; much more, therefore, when Revelation has proved the falsehood of the hypothesis. The conduct of Abraham, as recorded in Holy Writ, exactly agrees with this great principle. In the book of Genesis we read that "he builded an altar unto the Lord, and called upon the name of the Lord."[1] In no place do we find a trace of any other object of religious homage. The distinctive mark of Abraham's faith was not more his belief in one only God, than in his restricting all acts of worship to that one God alone. This was his visible standing testimony against the worship of intermediate beings, created to be ministers and mediators between God and man. And so Maimonides writes: Abraham "began to teach that none ought to be religiously worshipped save only the God of the whole world."[2] In like manner, the patriarchal families first, and the people of Israel afterwards, served as visible witnesses to this primary law of the true worship of God. Their whole history was a providential education, framed for the special purpose of weaning them from the Polytheism of the Gentiles to the unity of God. To this the three first commandments of the Law, the institution and types of the Tabernacle, the prohibition to have more altars than one, the institution of one temple in Jerusalem, were all directed. But it is needless in this treatise to enlarge on a point which every one

[1] Genesis xii. 8; xiii. 4.
[2] Cudworth, Int. Syst. p. 467.

ever so little familiar with Holy Writ will readily remember. It is enough to refer to the seductions of Balaam, the sins of Solomon and Ahab, and of the later kings of Judah, to remind us that the transgression which brought down God's wrath upon His people was the abdication of their high calling to testify to the world the mystery of the Divine Unity. They came short of the final end for which they were elected and constituted a peculiar people. Therefore God first gave them over to the neighbouring nations for chastisement, and finally carried them away to Babylon. It is remarkable that from that time they have never again fallen into idolatry. Their jealousy for the great mystery of the Divine Unity we shall have occasion to notice again hereafter.

The witness which had been so long, and with such various obscurations, borne by the Jewish Church, was taken up and perfected by the Christian. We may treat this witness under two aspects, the one testifying to the mystery of the one God, the other to the incommunicable character of worship.

The testimony of the Christian Church to the mystery of the one God runs through the whole body of the New Testament Scriptures: the "one God and one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus," may be called the *differentia* of Christianity as compared with all approximations to true religion. And as we find this running through the apostolic writings, so we find it as the

main feature of the primitive history. The Baptismal formula of three Persons and one God, and the Creed as the expansion of this mystery, is the rule of faith and sacred tradition of Christendom. In the writings of St. Irenæus, Tertullian, and others, it is treated as equivalent to the whole Gospel. For, indeed, in the doctrines of the ever-blessed Trinity and the Incarnation of the Son of God, all truth is contained by axioms and corollaries: "For this is life eternal, to know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom Thou hast sent."

Without dwelling longer on this acknowledged point, we may pass on to the second, namely, the incommunicable nature of worship. Perhaps the most pregnant evidence of the severe faithfulness with which the early Church restrained every form of worship to the One Invisible God is the charge of atheism which was rife against the primitive Christians. The martyrs of Christ are represented as being put to death all for atheism. The Christian apologists Athenagoras, Justin Martyr, Arnobius, and others, reckon atheism among the charges brought against them by the Heathen. One of the tests applied to Christians was an abjuration of their faith in these words, "Away with the Atheists."[1] The cause of all this was partly their condemnation of Polytheism, and partly the fact of their not permitting in their places of worship any visible repre-

[1] Bingham, Orig. Eccl. B. i. c. ii. 3.

sentations. This had been the characteristic mark of the Jews before them.[1] That the taint of creature-worship from time to time fastened itself upon unstable men is evident from frequent expressions in the Fathers, and from the Council of Laodicæa,[2] which was compelled to make a canon against the worshipping of angels. In like manner the Council of Eliberis[3] framed a canon prohibiting all pictures of the objects of worship, lest they should become a snare to the mind of the worshipper by drawing it to terminate on them. Another convincing proof of the jealous care of the Church in restricting worship to the one only God may be shown from the arguments used against the Heathen and the Arians. By the former they were charged with worshipping a man that was crucified.[4] They did not deny it, but justified the worship by proving that he was God: against the latter, who taught that the Son of God was a creature, they answered that they (the Arians) were thereby worshippers of the creature even as the Heathen.[5] The acts of worship were cited by them in proof of the God-

"Nil præter nubes et Cœli numen adorant."

Juv. xiv. 97.

So also Tacitus—"Judæi mente solâ, unumque Numen intelligunt—summum illud et æternum, neque mutabile, neque interiturum: igitur nulla simulacra urbibus suis, nedum templis sinunt." Hist. v. 5.

[2] Concil. Laod. can. xxxv. apud Bevereg. Synod: also Theodoret in Col. ii. 18.

[3] Concil. Elib. can. xxxvi. Ed. Albaspin.

[4] Bingham, Orig. Eccl. B. i. c. ii. xvi.

[5] Cudworth, Intell. Syst. pp. 627, 628.

head of our Lord Jesus Christ,[1] the axiom being unquestioned that worship is an exclusive and incommunicable prerogative of God.[2] Neither did they allow of subordinate senses of the term. Worship with them was an idea generically different from all other forms of reverence or veneration. It was not the idea of worshipping inferior beings as the one God—an error into which not even the more enlightened Heathen ever fell—but the worshipping them at all, that the Church condemned.[3] They knew no distinction between worship religious or not religious, supreme or subordinate: with them all worship was in itself religious and supreme.[4] This, then, was the great canon of the Church, that God alone is to be worshipped, and by this unity of worship, through the faith and sacraments, she has ever borne her witness in the world to the true knowledge of the One Supreme God.

The next point to be considered is in what manner the objective unity which consists in the organic system of the Church subserves the end of manifesting the true knowledge of God to the world.

[1] Bingham, Orig. Eccl. B. xiii. 2.

[2] "All worship is prerogative, and a flower
Of His rich crown, from whom lies no appeal
At the last hour.
Therefore we dare not from His garland steal
To make a posie for inferior power."
Herbert's Poems—*To All Angels and Saints.*

[3] Origen contra Cels. lib. viii. c. 26, Ed. Ben.

[4] It is remarkable that the Jews and Mahometans charged the Christians of the eighth century with dishonouring the Unity of God by idolatry, and the worship of many inferior beings.

And, first, it is evident that the "*oneliness*" of the Church—the fact, I mean, that there is one and one only visible body, endowed with divine functions and prerogatives—is an earthly type of the one only Divine Being.

The Heathen religions were manifold, and their churches, if we may so call the congregations of the initiated, were many. The Persians, Egyptians, Greeks, Romans, Teutones, though they had some common basis, had nevertheless a superstructure of Polytheism so various as to forbid intercommunion between the several sects. By the necessity of an ideal law, the multiplicity of gods produced a multiplicity of religions. Even in the same nation, and between neighbouring cities, the breaches of unity were many and irremediable.[1] Polytheism being a multiplicity of wills, every several deity being a several principle of volition, separation of worship and division of worshippers was inevitable. The multitude of sects was the expression of a multitude of objects of worship; and, by the inverse law, the oneliness of the Church is the image of the One only God.

But in the next place we may find a further and deeper proof of the unity of God in the objective organic unity of the Church.

As in the natural world the marks of design bespeak an intelligent Author, and the unity of design

[1] Juvenal, xv. 1.

the unity of the agent, so in the organic system of the Church.

The light of natural reason was enough to show to the philosophic Heathen that there must be one "and one only" first cause of all. They saw that two first causes would impose on each other a mutual limitation; that so both would be finite, and therefore neither could be eternal. To the eternity of any being they saw that infinity is absolutely necessary: they saw, therefore, that the cause of all must be absolute and one; and that, therefore, one is the mystery of all good and of all perfection; that one is the number which measures all numbers, but is itself immeasurable. The force of reason, therefore, compelled them into an acknowledgment of one Supreme God. But they saw also the image of the Divine Unity in the material world: they saw the laws and powers of nature at unity with each other and with themselves;[1] and some believed the world itself to be, as it were, God—some that God dwelt in it as life in a material body—some that the complex unity of nature was a sensible expression of the multiform unity of the Divine ideas. We have already seen St. Clement of Alexandria arguing that "whatsoever is most highly precious is praised in respect that it stands alone, being a likeness of the one first principle;" and that the transcendency of the Church, like the principle

[1] Cudworth, Int. Syst. pp. 372, 373: also Gale's Court of the Gentiles, B. 3. c. 9.

by which all things consist, which also surpasses all other things, and has nothing like or equal to it, is in its unity. So he says again: "His will is (His) work, and is named the world: so also His desire is the salvation of men, and is called the Church."[1] And in another place he says the Church is "the Divine will on Earth as it is in Heaven."

It is plain, then, that both the world and the Church being from the same Author, we should expect to find a parallel of analogous laws; and such, indeed, we find pervading the constitution of both. There is the same unity and harmony—the same adaptation of means to ends—the same principle of order and succession. What the laws of definite proportion are in the natural world, such the primitive ordinances of God are in His Church; both being expressions of His perfect will, arbitrary in their aspect to us, but hiding a mystery of wisdom, and a depth of purpose immutably true and right. What the law of form and structure is to the world of matter, such is the organized polity of God's moral creation—a polity which is whole in all its members, as Nature in her most perfect forms repeats herself in every part. For instance: the lines of natural descent, and the relations of subordination and equality, are types of the succession of Spiritual Fathers, and of the fellowship of Brethren, through the mystery of our second birth. In like manner we find certain moral characters impressed

[1] Pædag. tom. i. 114.

on the animal world, and no one can doubt that the instincts even of irrational creatures ought to be comprehended under this moral idea. The providence of the ant, the architectural cunning of the beaver, the mathematical skill of the bee, are all scintillations, as it were, of an higher intelligence; and the universal sameness of these instincts refers them all alike to one higher Mind. In the same manner, in each reasonable soul, the mystery of conscience, the consciousness of right and wrong, and of the moral consequences of each, the idea of retributive and distributive justice, the first foot-prints, as it were, of a moral Governor pervading all His responsible creatures, plainly mark out the unity of their Author and their Judge. And these unerring universal types of His moral law, contrasted with the infinite variations of individual character, and with the ten thousand shades of moral diversity which lie between right and wrong, so numerous that the infinitely diverse countenances of mankind are oftener alike than their infinitely varying characters —this contrast of one universal form impressed alike on all with the individual types which all so variously exhibit, as certainly refers that which is uniform to an unity of will, as that which is multiform to a multitude of volitions. Wheresoever there is no higher principle at work than the imperfect will of man, there must be variance and contradiction: harmony and unity attest the presence and will of God.

And as from the unity of the world we know the unity of its first cause, so from the unity of its operation we know the unity of its Ruler. The Divine monarchy is a truth which even Polytheists could not overlook. And this monarchy is forced into the light of our reason by the visible sameness of the moral government of the world. As the moral nature of individual men exhibits upon it the traces of God's law, so likewise do the aggregates of moral beings, whether in domestic or political society. The unity of political justice is a fact which the philosophers and orators of old clearly saw and reasoned on.[1] They saw that there was a monarchy over moral beings, guiding and governing their manifold and entangled actions; and they knew that this simple and unerring procedure was the express law and order of one Supreme Ruler. The monarchy of Providence was no less distinctly visible than the monarchy of creation. In like manner, by the same process, and by the same

[1] Est quidem vera lex recta ratio, naturæ congruens, diffusa in omnes, constans, sempiterna: quæ vocet ad officium jubendo, vetando a fraude deterreat, quæ tamen neque probos frustra jubet aut vetat, nec improbos jubendo aut vetando movet. Huic legi nec abrogari fas est, neque derogari ex hac aliquid licet, neque tota abrogari potest: nec vero aut per Senatum aut per populum solvi hac lege possumus: neque est quærendus explanator, aut interpres ejus alius; nec erit alia lex Romæ, alia Athenis, alia nunc, alia posthac; sed et omnes gentes, et omni tempore una lex et sempiterna et immutabilis continebit; unusque erit communis quasi magister et imperator omnium Deus, ille legis hujus inventor, disceptator, lator.—Cic. de Republica, lib. iii. xxii.

proofs, we shall find the monarchy of God exhibited in the economy of redemption. It is admitted that the "*singularity*" or "*oneliness*" of God's Church before Christ's coming, and the unity of its hierarchical structure, testified to the monarchy of God. The testimony of the Church Catholic is to the same point, and compels assent by its universality. The national and internal unity of Israel among the multitude of nations was a faint proof compared with the all-embracing, all-absorbing Church of Christ, which takes up into itself all nations, languages, people, and tongues, all schools and philosophies, all codes and polities, and assimilates and blends them into one. The testimony of the Church Catholic to the monarchy of God is therefore twofold: first, in the unity of its organic structure; and next, in its uniting virtue.

In its organic structure we find the miraculous phenomenon of a body of moral agents, a third part of all mankind, united for eighteen hundred years, in all regions of the world, under one definite law, and in one definite polity. The same proof which refers to God the sameness of universal instincts, and to man the diversity of political system, must in like manner solve the organic unity of the Church by referring it to the one ordaining Mind. It is plainly impossible, on the same laws of reasoning with which we treat other phenomena of the world, to refer the organic unity of the Church Catholic to any other or lesser cause. The universal law of succession, and the uni-

versal rule of a monarchical episcopate, absolutely demand a sole and uniform cause; and though we are now speaking chiefly of the political structure of the Catholic Church, we may not omit the unity of the Faith, of the moral law, and of the Divine worship. No consistent theory has ever been ventured on to explain the unity of the Faith on any principle which will not ultimately refer it to the unity of the Divine mind. Whether we acknowledge the Church to be a divinely ordained polity, or whether we suppose it to be no more than the result of a concurrent instinct of mankind, will matter but little in this view. Either way its unity and universality bespeak the unity of God. If Christianity were no more than an instinct pointing to the world unseen, and preparing for a future state, it must be referred for its author to the moral Governor of the world. To take the particular features of this one great fact: we find, in the midst of an endless variety and conflict of philosophical theories, an objective ideal system which is at unity with itself, spread abroad in all lands, and impressing itself upon minds the most various in learning and power: we find also, in the midst of unnumbered discrepancies of constituted right, a system of preceptive morality universally acknowledged even by those that uphold the most various economical and political systems.[1]

[1] Neque enim quia et in orbe terrarum plerumque regna dividuntur, ideo et unitas Christiana dividitur, cum in utraque parte Catholica inveniatur Ecclesia. S. Aug. de unit. Eccl. xiii.

We find, in the midst of numberless ways of adoring and propitiating the multitude of unseen beings, one form of worship, harmonious even in the minor features of its internal order, rising up and binding all nations into one. With these facts before us, I say it is impossible to conclude otherwise than that the diversities of philosophy, morality, and religion, are the natural offspring of the reason, the conscience, and the imagination of man, biassed and moulded by the manifold energy and inclination of the individual will, and that the unity of faith, morality, and worship, in the Catholic Church is the stamp of the one Divine intelligence upon the responsible creatures of His hand.

And because it is sometimes attempted, by those who reject the organic polity, to resolve the unity of the Catholic Church into an unity of will and spirit, it is worth while to observe, that with Catholic Christians there can be no question whether this unity of will and spirit be, in fact, contained in the design of God. About this there is no controversy; nay, they against whom it is wont to be objected hold and urge this truth even more strongly than others. The question is, whether there be not another unity subserving, in the nature of means, to this great end. But of this we shall speak hereafter; at present we have to observe—first, that they who labour to prove that the Church Catholic has not an organic unity, do, in fact, break down one argu-

ment for the Divine monarchy, no less than they who should deny the marks of design in the natural world by teaching the fortuitous concurrence of atoms, and the contingent nature of all specific forms. The visible directness of this parallel may well make men look again to the soundness of their reasoning: for it is certain that the unity of God is not more shown in the uniform structure of the visible world and in the unity of the Divine operations over all rational and irrational creatures, than in the objective unity of the worship, faith, and polity of the Church. And, upon examination, it will further appear that this great law of philosophical reasoning is no more than the inductive process contained in the argument from universal tradition, or, in more technical words, in the test of Vincent of Lerins: "Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus." Next, that their ideal principle inclines to the polytheistic: for they that held many inferior deities, held also a supreme monarchy, which was indeed over all, but was not manifested alike in all parts of the world; whence every nation became a Church to itself with infinite lesser varieties, but still holding the one common bond of a supreme worship. And, lastly, this mode of arguing has an affinity to that of the Arian and Socinian schools. For those who deny the consubstantial unity of three Persons, explain away the proofs of Holy Scripture into unity of mind and will; and they who deny the organic unity of the Church, ex-

plain away all passages which speak of oneness or schism into a mere agreement of charity and spirit.

We have now traced out the relation between the outward unity of the Church in its organic system and the true knowledge of the unity of God: we may therefore go on to see how the inward or moral unity is designed to subserve the same end.

And, first, it is obvious that the phenomenon of the Catholic Church, a body gathered out of all nations into one accordant and enduring fellowship, is a moral miracle of the first magnitude. The whole history of the world presents a series of empires rising and falling, sometimes crushed by the weight of a mightier kingdom, and sometimes broken up from within by the force of inward collisions. The whole history of each several empire —the Assyrian, the Persian, the Greek, and the Roman—is little more than a baffled endeavour to impose a constraining bond of unity on the repugnancies of the moral world. Even the last iron despotism, which was stronger than all before it, failed in the task. By the might of fear and force, it held, for a while, in awe a larger portion of mankind than any empire which had gone before it. But at the very heart of its power all the most direct antagonists of unity reigned supreme. The isolation of the individual will was universal; and the repulsive force of selfishness was ever at work to make the isolation still more complete. The conflict of kingdoms was only an aggregate expression of the clash of

individual wills. That such was the condition of the Heathen world is known to all; and that the first phenomenon of abiding unity appeared in the Jewish Church. There was a something which even the Heathen could not but acknowledge, though they could not understand it. But the full display of unity and permanence was reserved for the Church Catholic. It was this the Prophet Daniel wrote of when he said, "In the days of these kings shall the God of Heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed." Its imperishableness was the counter-signature of its Divine origin. As unity is an attribute of eternity, so is it the cause of imperishableness. Mankind stood in need of some common basis, which should be one and the same in all, to hold in check the tendency of imperfect natures to dissolution. And this was the function of the Church.

By the original sin of man, then, there was called into energy a repulsive power, which sunders the moral nature of man from his fellows. Sin has a direct tendency not only to repel man from God, but man from his kind. The whole race tends morally to isolation, as the dying body tends to the dissolution of its several parts. Hence comes the fall of kingdoms, the division of households, and the inward strife of man. They who have made a state of nature a state of war, have erred through the darkness of their natural reason; for the state of nature is God's ordinance, and has in it the relations of subordina-

tion and equality, and in its result is order. What half-sighted philosophers have imagined to be his aboriginal state, is but the perpetual defeat of this Divine ordinance of nature, and the moral repulsion of man's individual will. But their testimony is useful to our purpose, as showing how predominant a force in the moral world is the repelling power of individual wilfulness.

The function of the Church, therefore, is to restore to mankind a principle of moral cohesion. And this God has been pleased to do by taking up and carrying on to perfection His own original ordinance. The moral unity of a family is His own natural work. The political unity of a state is the expansion of a family. In the moral cohesion of the Church is contained both these forms of the one principle, perfected and spread abroad over the face of the world. And this moral power, which holds together elements by nature so repulsive, is a miracle as great as the perpetual sustaining of the frame of creation, and as the continuous energy of the Divine will, which "hangeth the world upon nothing."[1] There is manifestly a superhuman power brooding upon man, and raising him above himself; and this witness for the Divine Unity was the matter of our Saviour's prayer, when He asked of His Father, in behalf of His Universal Church, "That they all may be one, as Thou, Father, art in me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in us; *that the world*

[1] Job xxvi. 7.

may believe that Thou hast sent me."[1] This was to be the standing miracle in proof of His divine mission. The mutual love of Christians was a mystery related even to that of the Divine nature. It was even more wonderful to the world, and yet it was undeniable. Any form of speculative truth is less perplexing to the reason of man than the moral perfection of man's nature to his stunned and selfish heart: the conscious enmity of an evil will is more opposed to charity, than the perplexity and weakness of the reason to any transcendental mystery. The world could not deny the visible unity of the Church: but "the light shined in darkness, and the darkness comprehended it not."

The first great expression of this moral unity was the common worship, and the intercommunion of all Christians and all Churches in the one universal form of adoration. And the central point of this worship was the Holy Eucharist. But besides these joints and bands of the great miracle of charity, the Church silently testified at all times, by the habitual tenor of its practice, for the life of every Christian man was a type of the unity of God. The universal love of all, the various sympathy in joy and sorrow, the denial and subjugation of self for the sake of others, the forgiveness of injuries, the quenching of resentment, the love of enemies, were rays emanating from some central brightness. Their unearthliness and their inclination revealed their

[1] St. John xvii. 21.

advent to be from heaven, and their origin to be in God. Now we find the early writers pointedly using this argument to confirm the mystery of the Divine Unity; and also the mystery of the Divine nature, to prove the duty of moral unity. Of the latter St. Cyprian gives an example: "The Lord says, 'I and the Father are one.' And again, concerning the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, it is written, 'And these three are one.' And does any man believe that this unity, which is derived from the steadfastness of the Divine nature, and coheres by heavenly sacraments, may be rent asunder in the Church, and separated by the repulsion of clashing wills? He that holds not this unity, holds not the law of God, holds not the faith of the Father and the Son, holds neither life nor salvation."[1]

Of the other form of the argument the following passages will serve as examples. St. Athanasius, in rescuing out of the hands of the Arians the prayer of our Lord, cited above, says, "He did not say, 'That they may be one as we are,' meaning that we should be made such as He is; but that, as He, the Word, is in His own Father, so we also, having received a certain impress, and looking unto Him, may become one with each other in unanimity and in the Unity of the Spirit, and not be discordant as were the Corinthians, but be of one heart as were those five thousand in the Acts, who were all as one person . . . . . We being of one kindred with each other (for we are

[1] S. Cypr. de Unit. Eccl. c. 2.

all begotten from one, and the nature of all men is one) become one with each other in the disposition (of our mind) having as our pattern (or archetype) the oneness of nature which is between the Son and the Father."[1] So St. Augustin, speaking of the gathering together of all nations into one to serve the Lord, says, "In this he answered him, namely, in unity; for whosoever is not in unity answers him not. For He is one. The Church is unity. Nothing answers to one but unity."[2] And in another place, writing on the Holy Trinity, he says, "He would have His own to be one, in Himself, because in themselves they cannot be one, being severed from each other by various lusts and desires and impurities of sin. Wherefore they are cleansed by the Mediator that they may be one in Him, not only by that same nature through which all are made of mortal men to be the equals of angels, but also through the same and into the same blessedness which conspires with a perfect concord of will into one spirit, being fused, as it were, by the fire of charity. This is the intention of His words, 'That they may be one, as we are one.' That as the Father and the Son, not only by equality of substance, but by will, are one, so also they between whom and God the Son is mediator, not only for that they are of the same nature (i. e. *among themselves*), but also by the same fellowship of love, may be one."[3] St.

[1] S. Athan. Orat. iii. contra Arian. 20. Ed. Ben.
[2] S. Aug. in Psal. ci. 8. [3] De Trinitate, lib. iv. viii.

Cyril of Alexandria, in his Commentary on St. John, confuting the error of the Arians, says, on the same text, "This we shall necessarily repeat, that Christ, assuming the unity of substance which the Father hath with Him, and He with the Father, as an image or type of the unity of undivided love and agreement of mind, which is perceptible in the union of soul, would mingle us together as it were with each other, by the virtue of the holy and consubstantial Trinity, that the universal body of the Church may be perceived to be one by the coalition and concourse of two people into the constitution of one perfect (body), which grows up in Christ." So Theophylact, who may be taken as representing the expositors of the Greek Church, says, "'That the world may believe that Thou hast sent me;' forasmuch as by the concord of my disciples it shall be manifested of me the Teacher that I am sent from God. But if they contend with one another, men will not say that they are the disciples of the Peacemaker." Then, after quoting the verse, he adds, "What glory does He say He gave them? The glory of miracles, of doctrine, of teaching; and that other glory of unity of mind, that they may be one. For this glory is greater than that of miracles. For as we adore God with wonder, because in His nature there is neither strife nor conflict, and this is the greatest glory, so, saith He, let them be conspicuous, that is to say, by reason of their unity of

[1] S. Cyril. Alex. in Joan. Ev. lib. xi. 11.

mind."[1] These passages are sufficient to show in what way the early Christians argued from the unity of the Godhead to the subjective unity of the Church, and by the converse: the one form exhibiting the principle, the other the symbol; the unity of the Godhead being both the archetype and the cause; the unity of the Church the consequence and the expression. And this will be sufficient for our present purpose.

From what has been said, it is not difficult to perceive the ideal relation between the unity of the Divine nature and the unity of the Church. The visible phenomenon is in a manifold way declaratory of the invisible mystery: as, for instance, in the unity of its doctrine, which expressly teaches the oneness of the Divine nature; in the unity of its worship, which is uniform, and incommunicable, as the prerogative of God alone; in the unity of organic structure, which, like the framework of the universe, bespeaks one causative and conserving principle; in the unity of what may be called the universal laws, conditions, instincts, and energies of the Church, as those of the world may be called the universal ordinances, deposits, and traditions of nature; and, lastly, in the subjective unity of mind and action, which has no type, as it can have no cause, but in God Himself. In all these ways, dogmatic, organic, energetic, and moral, the One Holy Catholic Church is the earthly witness of the One Holy Trinity, God over all, blessed for ever.

[1] Theophyl. in loc.

CHAPTER III.

THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH—A MEANS TO RESTORE MAN TO THE IMAGE OF GOD.

We may now proceed to the next point, which is to ascertain in what way the Unity of the Church is a means of the restoration of man to the image of God.

And, first of all, we must take into the present chapter the conclusion of the last. It is obvious that a right knowledge of God is a necessary condition of the restoration of man to the image of God. And we have already seen how the Unity of the Church is the divinely ordained means of restoring that right knowledge. The reason, however, we are now in search of is of a more particular and proximate kind.

By the image of God is to be understood that holy state in which man was created. The test and distinguishing mark of this state was the unity of the will of man with the will of God: and in this

unity is potentially involved what was never actually manifested, namely, the unity of every several will with the wills of all mankind.

By the disobedience of the first man, or, in other words, by the collision of his will with the will of God, these unities were altogether marred. Every man born into the world brought with him into life a several will as far estranged from the will of God as the will of the first who fell. The multiplication of mankind, therefore, was the multiplication of disuniting principles. Every man, as he is severed from God, is severed also from his fellows; and holiness, which consists in love to God and man, in submission and brotherhood, was marred in its principle, and became impossible. To restore man therefore to holiness it was necessary to restore him to the moral unities which are its conditions and security. As these moral unities were the divine characters of the first creation, so are they of the second—that is, of the redemption and restoration of man. It is evident that the Unity of the Church is, as it were, the restored unity of the primordial creation. It is the will of God re-impressing itself as at the first upon the creatures from which it had been erased. And such is the uniform language of Holy Scripture. The prophets prophesied of the coming redemption as a power which should purge natural and moral evil out of the creatures of God,[1] which should heal and abolish the diseases and imperfec-

[1] Isaiah xi. 6.

tions of man,[1] and spread abroad new heavens and a new earth.[2]

The mystery of our Lord's birth teaches us the same truth. As in the creation God made the first Adam of the virgin earth, so in the restoration he made the manhood of the second Adam of the substance of a virgin mother. Either was respectively the first principle of a creation; Adam of the first, Christ of the second: St. Paul, speaking of both creation and redemption, calls our Lord the "first born of every creature,"[3] and "the beginning:"[4] again he says, "The first man is of the earth earthy, the second man is the Lord from Heaven."[5] In the Epistle to the Hebrews he draws the parallel further, showing that the subjection of all creatures to the dominion of Adam was typical of the sovereignty of Christ in the second creation.[6] St. John, in the Apocalypse, writes from His own mouth His title, "The beginning (ἀρχὴ, the originating principle) of the creation of God."[7] Therefore also St. Paul declares the redemption in Christ to be "a gathering together again"[8] of God's creatures "under one head" (ἀνακεφαλαίωσις). Our Lord himself calls it the "regeneration;"[9] and the being made partaker in it, being "born again;"[10] and of the man that is in Christ, it is said that he is "a new creature, old things are

[1] Isaiah xxxv. 6. [2] Ibid. lxvi. 22.
[3] Phil. i. 15. [4] Ib. 18. [5] 1 Cor. xv. 47.
[6] Heb. ii. 6—9. [7] Rev. iii. 14. [8] Eph. i. 10.
[9] St. Matth. xix. 28. [10] St. John iii. 3.

passed away, all things are become new;"[1] and that we are looking for "a new heaven and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness;" and he that sat on the throne, "from whose face the earth and the heavens fled away, and there was found no place for them,"[2] said, "Behold I make all things new."[3] It would be easy to multiply almost to any extent passages of the like kind, showing that the redemption of mankind is a new creation from the fallen nature of the old. And hence it is evident that the law of unity which pervaded the first pervades also the second creation of God. And the Unity of the Church, therefore, is in very deed the Unity of God's primordial work; and is the means of restoring and sustaining in man the image of God in which he was created.

But to follow out this inquiry further, it may first be observed that by the Unity of the Church all its members are gathered under one Head, who is the exemplar and type of all. As Adam in the old creation, so Christ in the new, is the pattern and form of man. The types of God's image are not many, but one only. He is "the image of the invisible God." And the oneness of the type impresses a law of unity on the body of those that are made like to it. The Unity of the Church therefore is the representative of the unity of this image; and not the representative only, but the result and consequence. Conformity to one and the same idea is

[1] 2 Cor. v. 17. [2] Rev. xx. 11. [3] Rev. xxi. 5.

unity in all beings, how many soever they be.[1] On one side therefore the unity of the type is the cause of unity in the Church, which is the hidden unity of saints in virtue of conformity to one common Lord. But in another sense the Unity of the Church is a means to conform mankind to the one universal type. And this is the point we are most concerned with, for the other is self-evident. The objective Unity of the Church is a means of restoring mankind to the image of God, first by gathering all men into one common family. "Of one blood he made all nations;" but they became severed and split asunder into many. The national will carried out and multiplied the disuniting forces of the individual will. Nations were as gigantic men. Their collective distinctness from other nations gave them a sort of individual being. Every nation had its own type, its own standard, its own prescriptions, its own traditive moralities, its own sympathy and antipathy. It was a great moral phenomenon of accumulated disunion, instinct with a life, the first condition of which was an energy antagonist to all other nations. By the objective Unity of the Church all these struggling powers were gathered and held in one. Mankind became once more an individual being. The one net was let down and enclosed a great multitude of all sorts, both good and bad; but with all their internal diversities they were still but one draught. The

[1] Orig. in Oseam, tom. iii. p. 439. Ed. Ben.

absolute oneness of mankind in body, soul, and spirit, and the unity of all in one common type from which all were in the beginning derived, is the true basis of unity in the society of the redeemed. This basis the Church, by binding all in one, has restored to the world. It is the bond of unity among the families of man; and by this they are knit again into the oneness of their common origin. This then is the first ordering and disposing of mankind towards the recovery of the one common type and image of God.

But, in the next place, the objective unity of the Church is a means to the restoration of God's image to mankind, by superinducing upon the families of man, thus knit in one, a common rule of life, and a common object of worship and imitation. The one doctrine and discipline of Christ is a principle of oneness and assimilation which imposes on all mankind, how divided soever by national and particular diversities, one governing and controlling power. The one Church, having its seat upon the springs of man's moral nature, checks and suspends the antagonist energies of individual and national will. It propagates one ideal standard of human perfection, to which all men alike tending are brought into unity with themselves. The expansion of what may be called the natural affections of the Christian family, so that the members of Christ shall in all lands find father and mother, and brethren and sisters; and the promised extinction of

warfare when men shall turn from the acts of bloodshed to the peaceful tillage of God's earth, are dispositions towards the moral renovation of the world, on which God's image shall be once more perfectly impressed. The unity of the principle of regeneration through "one baptism for the remission of sins" works as the leaven throughout the mighty mass. And, as St. Irenæus says it is as "a precious deposit of the Spirit of God in an excellent vessel, itself ever new, and ever renewing the vessel in which it is. For this gift of God is intrusted to the Church, as for the inspiration of His creatures, to the end that all members who receive it may be quickened with life." [1] It is everywhere alike, working by one heavenly virtue, and conforming the spirits of men to one common type. In like manner the one faith constrains the intellectual energies of men into one attitude of homage to eternal truth; and the one organic polity assimilates the moral habits of all nations into one order and inclination. This unity of mankind is in itself a part of the Divine image in which man was created, of which one leading feature is intrinsic unity.

But to go somewhat further into detail. It is evident that the restoration of the image of God to man, as it is a moral work, must needs be wrought under the conditions which control man's moral nature.

There is needed, therefore, first of all, a system

[1] S. Iren. lib. iii. xxiv.

which shall truly present to the reason and conscience of man a knowledge of the Divine image. From what has been said in the last Chapter it is evident that the unity of the Divine mind is expressed by the unity of all His works; and among them all, especially by the unity of that which is His latest and most perfect work, the Church. It is certainly hard to conceive that the knowledge of this unity could be propagated throughout the world by a number of distinct bodies: or, if for once propagated, that the knowledge could be preserved and handed on. The history of the old religions, and of the philosophic sects, the series and mutations of schools, are enough to show that in multiplicity there is always diversity. At the beginning they were diverse from each other, having no principle of agreement: in the end they were diverse from themselves, having no principle of transmission. The isolated tradition of particular sects, schools, nations, churches, has never been known to hold its identity from first to last. They have each one forfeited somewhat, and some have forfeited nearly all of the Divine type they were founded to convey. Nothing but a multiplicity of members organically one has ever yet preserved whole and unchanged its deposit of truth. The consent of the Church Catholic has done so. The unity of the Church, therefore, is a necessary condition to the preservation of that knowledge of the Divine mind which is a necessary condition to man's restoration to the Divine

image. But, to pursue this further, it may be added, that the one type of man's perfect nature to which all must be conformed, namely, the image of Jesus Christ, contains in itself the complete idea of moral unity. It exhibits the nature of man under the two aspects of its perfection in the unity of obedience to the will of God, and in the unity of charity with mankind; and, for the exhibition of this perfect example to the world, God has been pleased to guide His chosen servants both in their words and acts. It is not to be conceived that He should guide them in the use of language, and leave them without guidance in the determination of their actions; for it is by positive and visible institutions, not less than by words and parables, that the truth is bodied forth. It is evident that, as some words more truly than others express the mystery of Christ's perfect manhood, so do some symbolical institutions. And, as we must believe that, of all symbolical institutions by which this mystery could be expressed, the most exact and expressive would be chosen, so we must believe that the same would be ordained as the universal symbol and expression of the universal type. It stands to reason, therefore, that, as Christ is the express image of God in man's nature, so the body, which on earth is ordained to represent and transmit the exact knowledge of that one exemplar, must be itself perfectly framed, and adapted for its representative office; and as what is perfect is one,

therefore its leading feature must be unity of constitution. The Unity of the Church, therefore, is a foremost condition to the exact representation and faithful transmission of the type of the image of God in Jesus Christ, to whom mankind must be conformed.

Hitherto I have spoken of the Church only as a mode of expressing and preserving a knowledge of the Divine image: we must next regard it as a means of impressing it upon mankind, and as a discipline through which the moral nature of man is trained and likened to the image of God.

We have in part forestalled this topic, in speaking of the unity which is superinduced upon the nations of the world by the imposition of a common bond and rule of life. But we may now go more fully into particulars, and trace out the relation between the organic Unity of the Church and the discipline of the moral nature in each several man.

The perfection of man's nature consisting in the unity of his will with the will of God and with the wills of his fellow-men, it is evident that the moral discipline, be it what it may, by which he must be reduced to this twofold unity, must be so framed as to bear upon his moral nature on these two sides of it. Now we have already seen that the two relations which constitute the unity of the Church are those of subordination and equality; of subordination to an authority standing in the place of God,

and of equality with all who are in like manner gathered into one. The first relation, that of subordination to an authority ordained of God, is a moral corrective of the rebellious energies of the will by which in the beginning it revolted against God. Pride, self-trust, impatience of control, hankering after things forbidden, and all the manifold lower forms of these several sins, are met by a power of direct repression in the authority which God has ordained in His Church. God requires of us a renunciation of self-will, and He has therefore constituted an order which shall bear rule over His people, and shall bring them under the yoke of obedience to Himself. And in this is our chief conformity to the example of Christ, whose obedience on earth was opened with "Lo, I come to do thy will, O God;" and closed with "not my will, but thine, be done."

In like manner also the second relation, of equality, is a moral corrective of the evil motions which propagate sin and strife. The love of precedence, the lust for the highest place and the largest share, and the sins of force and fraud which minister to pride and covetousness, are directly encountered and repressed by the claims and duties of equality. The habits and energies of mind demanded and disciplined by this relation are those that constitute one of the highest degrees of likeness to the example of Christ, and therefore to the image of God. Lowliness, meekness, long-suffering, forbearance one of

another, and charity,[1] are the graces which are quickened and trained in the discipline of the one body: in it every form of self-denial is fostered and perfected after the example of Christ, who said, "If I your Lord and master have washed your feet, ye ought also to wash one another's feet."[2]

There is, then, an express adaptation of the organic unity of the Church to the nature of fallen man, an adaptation so designed by the wisdom of Him who made mankind, that it acts as a direct and searching corrective of the chief faults of his moral being. It meets him at the two points at which he is ever departing from the perfect law of his nature, and from the image of God: it meets him, and checks, and throws him in upon himself, and, by a continuous discipline, keeps up the conscious effort to renounce and to deny the self-will of his isolated nature. From childhood to old age, through all the stages and seasons of life, intermingling with all toils and pleasures in the throng of his fellow-men, and in solitude with God, the unity of the Church bears steadily down upon his individual will, reducing it to the bent and posture of its original unity with God and man.

Now it must be observed, further, that the perfection of this moral discipline lies not more in its intrinsic nature than in the sanction by which it is ordained. It might be thought that the voluntary submission of the will to Pastors chosen and ac-

[1] Eph. iv. 2, 3, 4. [2] St. John xiii. 14.

knowledged by the body of the Church, or by the individual man, and the mutual forbearance of members combined in a voluntary society, would not only work out the same, but cause a more perfect moral discipline, inasmuch as under both aspects it would be a *voluntary* submission and forbearance. But it is this which, in fact, vitiates the whole. In any form of Christian community, except only the one Church, the basis of unity is the choice of the individual will. The very idea of submission and forbearance, *chosen* by the individual will, implies its correlatives of personal independence and active selfishness as objects which might equally be chosen. To make the better choice may be an act of the individual will, as full of self-trust and self-determination as the sin of Adam. The sanction of Catholic unity is the will of God: it is a Divine discipline, and the submission and the equality exacted by it are exacted of all men alike, both willing and unwilling, in the name of God. No man may choose whether or no he will be a son of God, and a brother of Christ. This God has resolved, by the fiat of His Divine will, in electing us to the gift of regeneration in the unity of His Church. The same argument may be applied, therefore, to every form of unity, how nearly soever it may approach the true, if it fall short never so little; for that falling short, be it only in things which men call indifferent, forfeits the direct sanction of God. He is not its author; and though, in His merciful providence, He may become

in some sense its administrator, even as He is of all things, how imperfect soever they be, which tend towards the good of His creatures, yet there are visible tokens to be seen upon all communities of Christians, whether congregated by a conscious choice, or holding together in a lingering semblance of unity after the true bond of unity is broken, witnessing plainly, by the imperfect character of the results, that they are not the divinely appointed means of restoring man to the image of God. They have, for the most part, lost somewhat of the objective type—somewhat of the mystery of the perfection of man's nature in the manhood of Jesus Christ; or, if they have retained a formal acknowledgment of the truth, they have lost the moral perception of its meaning. When the subjective habit of faith has grown slack in themselves, and the spiritual perceptions of the mind blunted, they must sink back upon a lower level. Their highest types of character will be defective in the master-features of Christ's likeness. Among those that are severed from the unity of the Church may often be found a rigid morality, but little of the unearthly temper which marks the Catholic Saints. We often see strict truth, integrity, and benevolence, but little of the conscious awe of God's invisible presence, the subjugation of passion, and denial of self, which distinguishes a Saint from a Philosophic Moralist. We shall often see, likewise, much zeal, forwardness, and energy in action, but little of the meek-

ness, self-withdrawal, and devout humility which is the crowning glory of Christ's example. In fact, out of the unity of the Church we see the commoner virtues, which the world in part knew before Christ's coming, carried higher by the strength of Christianity; but of the higher graces, which the world never dreamed of, and which were manifested in Christ only, we can trace but faint lines anywhere except in the one Church alone. The reason of this seems evident. In no other body is there the divinely-adjusted discipline for the will of man. The plastic energy by which the character of Christ is remoulded in the moral nature is baffled for want of the organic structure through which the fitness and harmony of moral truth prescribe its action; just as the animal life fails of throwing out the highest forms of health where the bodily organization is maimed or wanting. We see, then, the example of our blessed Lord himself exhibited under the twofold aspect already spoken of: He stood between His Father and His brethren; to Him he was subordinate in all the powers of His will; for their sakes He denied Himself in all the sinless promptings of our manhood. So in like manner the pastors of His Church stand between Him and their flock. To Him they are subject in all the workings of the heart and will; for their flocks' sake they renounce their own desires, and choice, and self. And in like manner every member of the Church Catholic is placed between his Lord in heaven and his fellow-

men on earth; and in the particular Church where the gift of regeneration has assigned his lot, between his pastor and his brethren. The same twofold relation is to be traced in all these several forms of discipline. The moral nature of man is under the same conditions in all, and the resulting character is therefore alike. And this will explain why in the Church Catholic the traditionary type of character is the most perfect of all; because, with the exact transmission of the true objective idea, the subjective habit of the Church is ever sustained at a point of approximation which ensures a purer and truer perception of its moral completeness. The one perfect type is, if I may so say, connatural to the one body of Christ; and the whole lineage of Catholic saints will evince this truth. Their universal likeness each to all the rest, and all to their one exemplar, is an after-proof of exceeding strength, attesting the perfect design of the one great Lawgiver, who hath so framed His Church as to mould the moral elements of man into one predestinated form, conforming them "to the image of His Son, that He might be the first-born among many brethren."[1] To bring out this great mystery more clearly, we may take a parallel, such as St. Ignatius and St. Cyprian, both branded by the gainsayers of organic unity as rigid sticklers for forms and external systems, as credulous or ambitious monarchists in Church government. No two saints of old are

[1] Rom. viii. 29.

more identified with the particular kind of unity we are now speaking of. In ecclesiastical history, and in religious controversy, they are the main points of rally and assault. One in the East, the other in the West, nearly two hundred years apart in age, unlike in every other circumstance and condition of life; but one in the unity of Christ's Church; one in rule of faith, and habit of obedience; one in likeness to each other, and to their common type; like in obedience and in charity, in the bent and temper of the mind, in the active and passive graces of Christ's likeness; one in saintliness and in martyrdom. Where shall we find such a parallel between any two Christians severed from the unity of the Church? Or to take another parallel in St. Athanasius and St. Augustin, the great teachers and bishops of Alexandria and of Hippo. These come nearer to ourselves in the character of their life. They were neither of them martyrs. Their life was made up of common events. It was uncommon only in the measure of earnest, endless striving for truth, which was day by day crucified afresh before their eyes. They were, as the world judges, stubborn controversialists. Athanasius contended half a century about an iota, and Augustin half his life for what men now call an external form or accident. He declares with his own mouth that in the faith and sacraments of Christ the Donatists were as right as himself. But these saints were contending in defence of an objective system vital to the work of God in man. Each through

a long life, St. Athanasius to nearly eighty years, St. Augustin to seventy-six, prayed, fasted, catechised, taught, wrote, disputed in conference and in synod, enduring the cross for the Church of Christ. They were shadows of their Master, striving to win a gainsaying world to wisdom. "In Athanasius there was nothing observed throughout the course of that long tragedy other than such as very well became a wise man to do and a righteous to suffer. So that this was the plain condition of those times; the whole world was against Athanasius, and Athanasius against it: half an hundred of years spent in doubtful trial which of the two in the end would prevail, the side which had all, or else the part which had no friend but God and death—the one a defender of his innocency, the other a finisher of all his troubles."[1] Augustin for forty years contended against the falsehood and violence of a throng of heretics. On him, in Africa, fell the unbroken assault of Manichæans, Donatists, Circumcellians, Pelagians, Arians, and Heathen: he lived to see his country swept over by invading armies; and in his old age, when shut up in Hippo by the legions of the Vandals, prayed that God would either save his city from the siege, or release him from this troubled life: when God, it seems, knowing that the last light of the African Church was flickering, heard the latter prayer, and in the third month of the siege took him to his reward; and

[1] Hooker, Eccl. Pol. B. v. xlii.

so he died even as he had lived, shut up in the midst of troubles. Now, in these two great saints there was one only character. Though variously tried, there was one principle and attitude of mind. They intensely contemplated one and the same divine idea; and by gazing they grew into its likeness. They were moulded by the continuous pressure of the same discipline, conforming them to the same exemplar: in themselves they had the subordinate features of individual character, but in Christ they were as a twofold reflection of the same image cast on either side.

But there is also a further reason. The objective unity of the Church is a means to the restoration of man to the image of God, not only because it most truly expresses and transmits that one Divine image in the example of Christ, and because, through grace, it conforms the moral nature of man by a continual discipline into the likeness of that same image which it expresses, but because, by a deeper and more inward process, it acts upon the moral nature of man and reduces it to an inward unity with itself. The unity of the Godhead, as it is the principle, so it is the law of all subordinate beings. They are, as their first cause is, each several one an unity. Now the unity of the Godhead is twofold. The first, as we have said, is in the fact that besides Him there is none other God. The second is the oneness, or integrity, or wholeness, in which consists

perfection; as the unity of the three Persons in the ever-blessed Trinity.

In like manner, every several moral being is one. Each one is as it were a shadow cast from the Divine Unity, or a finite light kindled from the infinite fount of light. The multitude of beings is no more than a repetition of unity; the finite for the infinite. In this consists the unity of individual consciousness. As the Eternal spake, saying, "I am," so He has given to every moral being to be a shadow of His own incommunicable existence. We are ourselves, and not another. No other is partaker of our individual consciousness; of our living unity. On this finite symbol of Himself God impressed His own image; and man became a reason, a moral judge, a responsible agent, or, in one word, a will. In this is the light of the Divine Unity reflected with the directest ray. Every several being is a self-ruling principle of moral action. What God is to the creation and course of the world, each several man is to the work of his hands, and the government of his living powers.

It must be further considered, that, as the Divine image has an intrinsic unity of nature, so in its impression upon man is the same unity transmitted. We do but speak at random when we go beyond what God has spoken of Himself; but we may, nevertheless, contemplate goodness, wisdom, and power, as the confluent attributes of one Being,

and the confluent energies of one will. We may conceive how God is a law unto Himself; how the subjective goodness and wisdom of God are the objective good and true, which are co-eternal with the will of God; and thus how there is in every Divine energy an harmonious intercommunication of all moral characters which inhere in the one eternal Being.

In like manner, in the soul of man God impressed His own intrinsic unity. His moral and intellectual natures, the one enlightened by wisdom, the other instinct with goodness, and the will, issuing forth in harmony with both, make up the full stamp of the archetypal seal, which is the image or character of God.[1] The spiritual being of man thus coalesced into one absolute whole. The whole man partook altogether of every act. As by the unity of energy and sensation the whole body partakes in every act and passion, so the whole inner nature, by supremacy[2] and subordination, intercommunication and correspondence of parts and functions, thought, felt, and spoke, and acted as one indivisible whole. The will in the moral reason ruled supreme over all affections and passions of man. There was the unity of a spiritual monarchy, with internal order and spontaneous obedience. He was even as God, a law unto himself. He had one will, coincident with the will of God. It streamed forth in one

[1] Cudworth's Immutable Moral. p. 36.
[2] Butler's Sermons on Human Nature, Serm. ii.

right line between the parallel currents of wisdom and goodness. The sin of man began and ended in a breach of this intrinsic unity. The revolt of his lower passions dethroned the rational and moral will, and usurped each one a share in the principle of volition. "When a man, who is a unity (monad), sins, he becomes manifold, being abscinded from God, and severed into parts through falling from his own oneness."[1] His one will becomes a multiplicity of wills, as a flame, beaten down in its ascent, is severed into many flames, and turns every way; so the will of man, averted from God, reaches out around, and is drawn on all sides by objects of sense, and becomes the slave of many lusts. The multiplicity of wills in one being is sin, because where there is multiplicity there must be evil, for good is one;[2] there must be collision, for evil is self-destructive; there must be distraction, for it is intrinsically repulsive. This inward anarchy is the moral opposite and conscious antagonist of the Divine image. As it expelled it in the beginning, so it resists its restoration now. The nature of man must be once more reduced to its intrinsic unity, before the image of God can be again impressed upon it. Now the two generic forms in which sins exhibit themselves are usurpation upon the majesty of God, and usurpation upon the equal rights of other men. The specific kinds are beyond number. They are as many as

[1] Orig. in Oseam, tom. iii. 439.

[2] ἔσθλοι μὲν γὰρ ἁπλῶς παντοδαπῶς δὲ κακόι. Aristot. Eth. Nic. ii. 6.

the manifold lusts of man's heart, multiplied by all the gradations of intensity, and by all the inexhaustible combinations of circumstance, condition, and aggravation. What is needed, therefore, is a power to subdue, and to repress the human will; and this the Church provides. By her authority, as God's vicar on the earth, she subjugates the whole energy of man which struggles against the will of God. By her inward discipline she checks and, through grace, subdues to the conscience the aggressive and importunate affections of our nature. These two forces are perpetually compressing, as it were, the distracted spirit of man to an unity with itself; and by this they strengthen the natural powers of the soul. The authority of God arms the converted will with a new force to coerce the lower appetites; the discipline of the Church weakens the lower appetites by check and by repression, and so drives them under the inward sway of conscience. It is by this equable pressure that the dislocated members are reduced to their natural site and functions. By the illumination of the intellectual nature through the one objective doctrine, and by the purifying of the moral nature through the one objective discipline, the will is once more enthroned supreme, and its energies united with the will of God. Obedience passes, by little and little, from deliberation and conscious effort to a ready and almost unconscious volition. It becomes like the docility and innocence of childhood; and the unity of the Church is the mould

in which this character is recast. The adaptation of the outward system to this result is obvious to all who remember that by the gift of regeneration we receive the grace of sonship from God; and by the organic system of the Church is expressed the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of all mankind. We are placed, as it were, under the discipline of childhood. It is the very discipline of a household dilated to a Church; the original discipline of nature strengthened and stretched abroad by the hand of God, so as to hold all men under one common Father. The lineage of natural birth has neither virtue nor commission for more than the discipline of natural childhood; but the lineage of Faith, which is the Church, a body visible, organized, articulated as the family of man, takes up the whole aggregate of moral life, and carries on its training for a riper state, to which this world is as a childhood. The objective unity of the Church, therefore, has the same direct adaptation to the perfect restoration of the Divine image in man, as the objective unity of a family has to develop the gift of regeneration into the rudiments of that image; being the natural discipline of humanity enlarged and transfigured. And on this we need only remark, further, that the voluntary aggregations of men into communities professing Christianity are no more Churches, than an arbitrary combination of fathers and children under one roof are a family. The one constitutive principle is wanting, which is the will of God knitting

them in one by a revealed or natural sanction. They have not the first element of moral unity. They have no relation to each other; no fatherly authority, no brotherly claims. The very essence of a family is natural order, based upon the duties of submission and the rights of equality. God is the author of these relations by the appointments of nature. The lines of parental authority are a silent revelation, as divine as the voice of God at Sinai; and the polity of a family is as exactly ordained of God as the pattern which was shown to Moses in the Mount. Without this authorship and sanction there could be no parental authority, and no filial obedience, and, therefore, no moral discipline of the will. For this reason the divinely constituted polity of the Church effects what no other system can.

And, once more, the difference between a civil and a domestic polity lies chiefly in this. The civil can coerce outward but not inward obedience; it can reach the acts but not the affections of men; it can prescribe for the broader but not for the finer moralities of life. The civil governor can but mould the frame or skeleton of the outward conduct: all that makes up life and character is beyond his power. This only the suasion and correction of domestic discipline, that is of fatherhood, can reach and fashion; and therefore it is that in families men's characters are formed, but in states only their actions are governed. But the one Church, which is an expanded family under the father-

hood of God, can do both. It forms by an outward or political coercion the exterior course of obedience, and it shapes by a lighter and unerring hand the full lineaments of Christ's image. Its correction reaches the unwritten moralities: it enters into the inner heart of man; it forbids unforgiving thoughts; it commands a man to render good for evil, blessing for cursing; it obliges him to love God and man, and it rebukes him if he disobey. It works as the presiding wisdom of a father, and broods with the creative energy of the Divine presence over the moral world as it rises again towards the image of God.

To sum up this Chapter: it may be said that the objective Unity of the Church is a means of restoring man to the image of God, by expressing and transmitting the knowledge of that image in the manhood of Christ: by impressing it upon man through the one gift of regeneration, and the one organic discipline: by uniting all nations in one body, and bringing them under one rule and power: by correcting the exorbitances of human actions, and reducing the moral nature of man to unity with itself: in which unity of the rational and moral will consists the image of God in man. The Unity of the Church, therefore, may be called the Sacrament of the Divine image, being a means ordained of God, through Christ, for restoring it to the moral being of mankind.

CHAPTER IV.

THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH A PROBATION OF THE FAITH AND WILL OF MAN.

The next point to be shown is, how the Unity of the Church is a means in the moral probation of man.

It is evident, as I have said before, that the work of our redemption in us is a transcendent mystery, of which the will of man is the centre. We must believe that the fall both of angels and of men is the alienation of the will from God; and that our redemption is the reclaiming of it from the bondage of evil. It follows, therefore, upon this, that the whole scheme of our redemption should be so framed as to address itself directly to the principle of volition. By baptism the will is not extinguished, but regenerated; by our after-discipline it is not overborne, but strengthened to perfection. The argument of the last Chapter may be here taken as the

basis of the present, and we may rest upon it, while we confine ourselves to tracing out one of its features, which is a trait so leading and prominent as to be almost specifically distinct.

In the first place, then, we may observe that the Unity of the Church is a probation of the faith of man—as an object proposed to his belief. That God should interpose to save man at all is of course a probation of faith: that He should undertake to save man in this or that particular way, or in this and in no other way, *e. g.* through the one sacrifice of His Son, is a further probation of our faith. Unbelievers, both heathen and apostate, have cavilled at the way of our redemption through Christ: at the unobviousness of its intrinsic efficacy: at the seeming inconsecutiveness of the ideas of His death and of our forgiveness: at the narrowness and exclusiveness, if I may so speak, of the scheme which shuts out every other form of propitiation and acceptable obedience. It is plain, therefore, that not only is the fact of our redemption, but the unity of the way of our redemption, a probation of the faith of man. Now our present argument is ulterior and parallel to this: as it has pleased God to ordain one sacrifice as the meritorious cause of our redemption, so He has ordained one Church as the channel of its communication to mankind. It is a probation of man's faith, therefore, to believe that to this one Church alone, and to no other community, sect, or body, is the virtue of the Divine Sacrifice, and the

authority of God to apply it to the spirits of men, intrusted.

As for instance: the heathen of old had in every several nation their mode of propitiation, and their philosophy of life. But in the midst of them all was the Jewish people as a consecrated shrine, in which alone dwelt the presence of God. To this, such as had faith were proselyted: God having made provision, not for the recognition of other systems, but for the absorption of them into one. In like manner, at the promulgation of the Gospel, the same line of unity was carried on. Salvation was not declared to be in other modes of propitiation, but all nations were called to partake of the one Church, in which was enshrined the one altar, and the one only Sacrifice. The Church, therefore, presented itself to the nations as a great visible phenomenon, as one vast overspreading shadow cast from the one invisible mercy-seat, in the shelter of which alone there was salvation for mankind. It came to them as a whole, as a sacrament of hidden grace, as a sole messenger of glad tidings. Their probation was to receive it or reject it as a whole; and they were either saved or not saved accordingly. "If our Gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost." "We are unto God a sweet savour in Christ, both in them that are saved and in them that perish." They were either baptized or not; they either washed away their sins or not; they were either regenerated or not; they were either

saved in the one Church or not: they had no other to turn to: no sacred mystery, no philosophic school: there was only one "name under heaven given among men whereby they might be saved;" and the power of that name was enshrined in the one Church, at the advent of which all other religions everywhere fell prostrate, and all other philosophies were abolished.

It was the Unity of the Church that demanded this unity and singleness of choice, and thus summed up their probation into one decision of the will. They could not accept one part and reject another; they could not take the doctrine and refuse the dicipline of the Church: it was as the voice and the form of one heavenly being, like the angel visitors of old. Every attempt to cull out, and to accommodate any portion or feature of the evangelical phenomenon, produced a heresy or a schism; and the Church disowned both as spurious offsets, as mere mocking phantoms personating the one only Church of God. Along the whole stream of her history the Church moved on in solitude, accepting nothing but an absolute submission, and an universal homage from all the powers of man to all the mysteries of God. Not only the Gnostic, Ebionite, and Arian heresies which violated the unity of truth, but the Novatian and Donatist schisms which swerved from the unity of form, alike cut off the originators and maintainers of their error from the one body of Christ. Their attempt was to

retouch the perfect and unchangeable ordinance of God. In so doing they fell from it altogether. The same also was the probation of Constantine. Men sometimes speak as if he had made choice of the Church Catholic from a throng of other Christian bodies, and advanced it to a special precedence. But he knew no choice save only Christianity in the Church or Paganism without it. To the Church, as God's only representative and vicegerent upon earth, he yielded up himself and his imperial power.

In truth it is an easier thing to believe that God will save man in a multitude of ways than that He has ordained but one. There is an innate readiness in mankind to believe that they shall stand well with God in all ways; and an equal unwillingness to believe that it shall go hard with them in any. Therefore it is that the limitation implied in propounding one Divine ordinance as the way of salvation crosses every other predisposition of man's natural heart. It seems to him unreasonable and arbitrary. He sees much that bears the semblance of truth and goodness in other systems, and he compares and measures, and concludes the difference to be not in kind but in degree. And yet men who so reason believe in the Divine institution of the Holy Sacraments. They can believe that baptism alone confers a title to Christianity, and yet cannot believe that the Church alone contains an authority to baptize. The man

that believes in one baptism for the remission of sin, but not in one Church for the salvation of mankind, is plainly inconsistent in his reasoning. One baptism is a condition as arbitrary and exclusive as one Church. It would be hard for them to say why the rejection of baptism when offered to them involves a greater failure in the moral probation than a rejection of the Church. Nay, it would be easier to prove against them, by reasoning *à priori* from what seems fit, and likely too, that God has constituted on earth one and one only authoritative witness of Himself, than that he has tied remission of sins to one, and that not so much a moral as a merely positive ordinance. And so indeed it will be found at last, that the objection, although made apparently against this or that particular way in which it is alleged that God has ordained the salvation of the world, is made in fact against the idea of God's ordaining any positive way at all. In the full career of objection men are hardly aware of the moral habit which impels them. The idea that the authority of God is by revelation lodged anywhere at all among men is a greater difficulty to man's heart, than that it is lodged in this or in that, or in any one only body. The first is a question of the fact, the latter is only an after-adjustment of the mode or degree of the expansion or contraction of the area of the mystery which is admitted to exist. Here is the real struggle. It is the unconscious pantheism of our nature striving to re-assert its ascendancy within the precincts of

Christianity, and urging men to believe that the will and presence of God, if expressed anywhere, is expressed everywhere: that the authority of God, if intrusted to one particular body, is intrusted equally to all. But this is in fact to get rid of the whole idea: for by such an intellectual process other Christian communities are not raised to the direct sanctions of the Catholic Church; but her positive and direct institution is denied or explained away to reduce her also to the permissive, unauthoritative character of the rest. It exacts too much of the lurking incredulity of man to believe that the Pastors of the Church are directly commissioned from heaven: that their office is "not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised him from the dead."[1] This brings too near the contact between heaven and earth. Men see around them others, it may be, more learned, more devoted, more self-denying, more unwearied in good works, more effectual in persuasion, and they cannot believe these to be without commission and the others to possess the authority of God. And thus the doctrine of the Apostolical Succession, which is the Unity of the Church under its primary aspect, is after all a probation of faith. The very idea of a lineage transmitting the authority which God gave to His Son Jesus Christ is an object and article of belief requiring not more conviction of reason than docility of heart. Where one man

[1] Gal. i. 1.

rejects it at the dictate of the mind, judging by evidence, multitudes reject it at the instigation of the heart, failing at the probation of believing in the continuous presence of God's direct authority. We shall find this indocility and lack of faith running through their views of the whole work of redemption. As, for instance, there are many who altogether disbelieve the power of absolution. They mask their incredulity under a jealousy for God, as they who objected to our Lord, "Who can forgive sins but God only?"[1] But on this axiom there is no controversy. The only question is, whether or no God has intrusted to any upon earth the power to forgive sins. And this returns into the Apostolical Succession, and that into the Unity of the Church, which, after all, lies at the bottom of their probation. So again there are others who believe that there exists in the Church a power of absolution, and yet cannot define what it is. They cannot believe it to be authoritative, like the absolution of the Apostles; nor yet unauthoritative, like the declarations of laymen. They are perplexed and sometimes irritated: they chafe against the pretension, and yet cannot deny it altogether; as being in a strait between usurping upon the prerogative of God and diminishing the authority of the Church. Now in this case also the question returns into the idea of one divinely-commissioned body speaking in the name of God. The probation is to believe that there is

[1] St. Mark ii. 7.

such a body on earth, and that it alone has the plenary authority of Him who said, "As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you."[1]

We shall the more evidently see how this, after all, is no more than a simple probation of faith, if we consider how much apparent Christianity there is in the world without any faith at all. To become a Christian in the beginning of the Gospel was a conscious act of the individual choice and will. And so it is still in the conversion of adults. But as these are the rare and outlying exceptions, the whole body of Christendom is by an act of God made Christian without any conscious act of choice. Generation after generation grows up among the objects of faith, and as the energy of the reason and the heart unfold, every several reality of faith, unless slighted, becomes a direct probation of the will. The Unity of the Church is an article of the Baptismal Creed, and an object of faith as truly and fully as the article of the Incarnation, or Resurrection of Christ. These articles are by perfect Christians consciously accepted one by one, until the whole is incorporated in the moral nature. Oftentimes they are held implicitly: sometimes they are in part secretly rejected: sometimes they may be reduced to the smallest remainder which will consist with a continued profession of Christianity: sometimes they are so faintly held as rather to be not denied than believed. And yet we shall find all these several

[1] St. John xx. 21.

classes of persons living, more or less, a seemingly Christian life. They fulfil the obligations of personal and economical morality: they observe the rights of political justice: they are blameless sons, fathers, citizens: they mix in the communion of the Church and partake of her ministrations, but their outward life is rather a coincidence with her moral scheme, than a consequence of her spiritual grace. Now such men, looking around them, and seeing in other communities all they are conscious of in themselves, having no aspiration, no sympathy, no weakness which might not be satisfied as well without as within the Church, cannot but regard the Church as only one of many like communities, perhaps the oldest, it may be the best, the most conformable to society as a whole, and the most helpful to the offices of civil government, and yet, after all, only one of a number all equally wanting in direct authority from God. The Unity of the Church is the matter of their probation. They neither believe it as a mystery, nor yearn after it as the stay of their soul. It is the same habit which makes other men deliberately reject or indolently slight the Sacraments of Christ: they neither believe in their mysterious power, nor feel their own need of the proffered grace. The Unity of the Church may be viewed as the one all-comprehending Sacrament of the Person of Christ, from the side of which Holy Baptism and the Holy Eucharist flow forth as the water and the blood. All these doctrines then

are objects of faith; and by propounding them to the world, the faith of man is put on trial before God.

We may now go on to another topic. The Unity of the Church is a continuous probation of the moral habit of man as a discipline of the will. We have already trenched upon a portion of this subject in showing how the Unity of the Church acts as a plastic discipline in the restoration of man to the Divine image. We shall now examine the ethical process of that discipline. By the objective Unity of the Church, which is the direct institution of God, He has gathered into one body a large portion of mankind. He has so disposed that one body into an organic and articulated system, as to develop a perfect internal order of supremacy, subjection, and mutual relation of parts. The proximate final aim of this objective unity is, as I have said, the subjective or moral Unity of the Church: they are as cause and consequence, or rather as means and end.

The simplest form of this principle is the internal unity of a single flock under its pastor. In every such body there is an aggregation of individual wills, of which each severally contains a disturbing force, tending perpetually to a disruption of unity. Of this St. Augustine speaks in expounding the mystical import of the miraculous draught of fishes. "The two ships," he says, "did not sink, but were in danger of sinking. Why in danger? Because of the multitude of fishes.

By this is signified that by the multitude which the Church should afterwards gather together discipline should be endangered; and this is added in the account of the draught of fishes, that the nets were broken by the multitude of fishes. What do the broken nets signify but the schisms which should come? There are therefore three things signified in this draught of fishes—the mixture of good and evil men, the pressure of multitudes, and the separation of heretics."[1] "Let us see if there be not gathered in the Church such a multitude, that the grain scarcely appears in so great a mass of chaff. How many robbers, how many drunkards, how many cursers, how many frequenters of theatres! Do not the very same men fill the churches who fill also the theatres? and for the most part seek by seditions in the Church the very same things they are wont to seek in the theatres? and if anything of a spiritual kind be spoken or enjoined they resist, and contend against it, following after the flesh and fighting against the Holy Ghost. . . . . Then it follows that the nets were broken. The nets being broken, heresies and schisms are made. The nets enclosed all; but the fish, impatient and unwilling to come to the food of the Lord, wheresoever they can, free themselves and break and go out. And these nets were spread abroad everywhere; but they who break them break them in parts. The Donatists broke them in Africa,

[1] S. Aug. Serm. ccli. In dieb. Pasch. v. 1034.

the Arians broke them in Egypt, the Photinians broke them in Pannonia, the Cataphryges broke them in Phrygia, the Manichæans broke them in Persia. In how many places was the net broken and yet those whom it enclosed it drew to shore. It drew them to shore, indeed; but did it bring them that broke the nets? All the bad went forth. Only the bad went forth, though there yet remained both good and bad."[1] In this we have a vivid expression of the moral probation of men through the objective unity of discipline. It is the fine and fragile bond which gathers them in one, strong enough to hold the willing, and to check the faint struggles of an uncertain resistance, but yielding a ready outlet to the stubborn and the violent. This thread of unity by its very frailty is the finer and severer probation of the will. It is a "law of liberty" prompting the inner man at the suggestion of Christ's example. The evangelical axioms, "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them," "Look not every man on his own things, but every man also on the things of others," "Be subject one to another," "Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves," "Whosoever will be great among you let him be your minister,"—these and the like first laws, enjoining subordination and brotherhood in Christ, prescribe to us the tempers which, as they conserve the Unity of the Church, so are they tested and ascertained by the unity of discipline.

[1] S. Aug. Serm. cclii.

There is also in the order of the Church a probation of our intellectual nature, for the right conduct of which we are responsible. The tendency of all men is to put subjective opinion in the place of objective truth. This is directly encountered by the delivery of a dogmatic faith embodied in creeds and Catholic traditions; and the probation of the moral reason is brought to a point by the subjection of men as learners to an order of men who are divinely commissioned to teach. Against this ordinance of Christ the whole throng of indocile, self-trusting, irreverent, contemptuous dispositions of the heart rise in rebellion. And so it was foreseen; and for the mortification and rooting out of these tempers this very ordinance was designed; and their revolt manifests His wisdom who ordained it as a test to detect and a curb to check them. The whole lineage of heresies, and the whole history of schism, is but a continuous attestation that the pastoral office is the institution of Him who knew what was in man. The idea of humbly learning God's truth, and of passively receiving sacramental mysteries from the hands of a man like ourselves; of submitting to counsel, reproof, rebuke, correction, at the judgment of a fellow-sinner, is a test and probation of our moral habit, which by its searching and salutary virtue attests itself to be of God. In this way, then, the objective Unity of the Church tries man in the two points of moral duty least

akin to his fallen nature—forbearance and submission.

The same remarks, it is plain, will apply in like manner to the fellowship of pastors under their superiors in every subdivision of the Catholic Church, until we reach the college of Catholic bishops, by whom the whole is governed. The absolute irresponsibility of every Catholic bishop, so long as he shall administer his Church within the rule of canonical order, and keep himself free from pravity of doctrine and viciousness of life, is an axiom as self-evident as the absolute equality of the Apostles. Within the limits above prescribed they owe an account to God alone.[1] Now, as it is through their pastor that the members of every several flock are in unity with each other, so it is through the bishop that every several Church is in unity with the Church at large. The bishops, therefore, are likewise on a probation of mutual forbearance and forgiveness one with another. It was to warn them especially against the love of precedence and lust of dominion that our Lord washed His Apostles' feet. He foresaw how naturally they leaned towards the depression of others and the elevation of themselves; and how surely these motives would afterwards ripen into ambitious usurpation and antichristian aggression. Therefore in the apostolic college He instituted the seminal principle of Catholic unity, namely, a precedence among equals, and by His

[1] S. Cyp. Ep. xxxi. and Concil. Carthag. p. 330. ed. Ben.

example taught the moral habit which alone can keep it whole and undivided. The mutual relation, therefore, of Catholic bishops in the universal Church is the same test of brotherly equality; and they, too, have a master in heaven to whom they must render account of all their trespasses against His ordinance and His example.

And in this way it is that Christ weighs the spirits of all His servants. The balanced order in which He has disposed them is so delicate and nice that it will indicate the lightest swaying of the will. They are so poised between the harmonised powers of a manifold influence that self cannot stir without detection. And this wonderful scheme is a divine work. The contrivances of man are cumbrous, irregular, and self-defeating. None could devise it but He only "who doth bind the sweet influences of the Pleiades, and loose the bands of Orion." The faults and defects of human systems betray themselves by bringing on their own dissolution; *e. g.* the secessions from voluntary and defectible societies end in absolute extinction: but in the one indefectible Church they work out the mind of God: while they seem to defeat, they do but fulfil His purpose. "There must be also heresies among you, that they which are approved (*οἱ δόκιμοι*, the tested, or tried) may be made manifest."[1] "They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would

[1] 1 Cor. xi. 19.

no doubt have continued with us; but they went out, that they might be made manifest that they were not all of us."[1] They that separate from the Unity of the Church condemn themselves; they lay open their own moral disease before men and angels; they prove in deed what they deny in word, that their moral habit has an antipathy to equality and to submission; that their will is not at unity with God. By this principle we may solve all the phenomena of contention between Christian men and Christian Churches from the beginning of the Gospel. The objective Unity of the Church, as the net, has enclosed them in a continuous probation. It has done its work both when it has held them fast and when it has let them break through. Either way they were made manifest; either way they were approved or reprobate. While men have disputed against unity it has proved them: it casts upon them a spell of self-detection: itself abiding inviolate, it suffers them to depart convicted of themselves: for what is this probation of man but the presence of Him "whose fan is in His hand," who even now in the midst unseen is thoroughly purging his floor, against that day when He shall "gather His wheat into the garner," and "burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire."

In the course of these remarks, then, we have seen that the objective unity of doctrine and discipline is a means ordained of God to work out the subjective

[1] 1 St. John ii. 19.

Unity of the Church. Now from this principle will follow two consequences of the greatest moment; and to these, therefore, we must advert. And, first, it is evident that the objective unity cannot be wholly forfeited without a forfeiture of the subjective unity, and therein of all that is essential to the being of the Church. I say wholly, because there are faults and failures of a particular and limited kind which we must hereafter examine severally and with attention. I speak now of the casting off of the doctrine and discipline of the Church whether by an individual, or by a nation. It is plain that by so doing they forfeit the presence of the Church altogether, just as much as they who reject the consecrated elements make forfeit of the Sacraments of Christ. What is it that distinguishes a Christian from a Heathen people, but the possession and transmission of that objective system of truth and practice, or, in other words, of doctrine and discipline which was "once delivered to the saints"? By forfeiting them, howsoever much of lingering truth and morality they may retain, the nation becomes dechristianized, as Trypho, the Jew, by the rejection of the Mosaic, and the adoption of the philosophic system, denationalized and disinherited himself from the family of Abraham. Such, too, is the condition of many countries in Africa and the East. from which the Church was swept away by the flood of the Arabian Antichrist. The reason of this is plain. The revelation of the Gospel is an ordinance of

God. It comes from above; is external to the mind and heart of man; is propagated by a series of acts, such as ordination, succession, sacraments; is embodied in documents such as the Scriptures and rituals. The cessation of these mystical acts is a breach in the line, and a forfeiture of the hold which was before maintained on the original institution of Christ. The Church as an external ordinance, although it is in many other respects unlike, may be compared to a lineal succession of a governing power and an organic civil polity. When these are forfeited, there is an actual extinction of the first idea of a kingdom. The people yet remains, but without unity and without government. The nation yet subsists in its elements, but the individual national life is gone. As a body or system it is perished. This, in the words of our Lord, is the removing of the "candlestick out of his place."

The next conclusion is this, that the subjective unity may be forfeited without a forfeiture of the objective unity. It is obvious that the forfeiture of the Sacraments involves a forfeiture of the grace of the Sacraments. But the converse is not true. The grace of the Sacraments is often baffled and repelled, while the Sacraments remain perfect. Simon Magus received Baptism, though he received not the grace of Baptism.[1] So in the body of the

[1] "Nihil profuit Simoni Mago visibilis baptismus cui sanctificatio invisibilis defuit." S. Aug. Quæst. in Levit. lxxxiv. tom. iii. 524.

Church at all times the grace of the Sacraments is perhaps baffled and forfeited by the majority of adult Christians, though the Sacraments are still in full power and authority testifying against them. So again with the objective Unity of the Church, which is the means, and may be called the sacrament, of subjective or moral unity; the sins and divisions of men may render ineffectual all its grace and discipline. This we see continually and in almost every flock: there are everywhere members who by schismatical tempers are perpetually forfeiting the grace of moral unity, while none of them commit acts which involve excommunication; and as with the individual members of a particular Church, so is it with the collective members of the Church universal. The peace and amity between churches has been oftentimes broken, sometimes by the sins, and sometimes by the misunderstandings of pastors and bishops. A total suspension of communion has sometimes lasted for many years, without either side incurring the sin of formal heresy or schism, which alone separate a Church from the body of Christ. And what has lasted long may last always, without the cutting off of either from the objective Unity of the Church. Although the channels of communion on earth are cut asunder, yet the lines of ascent and descent from earth to heaven, by which the communion of sacrifice and grace is interchanged between the faithful and their unseen Head, are open and sure.

And this will be the more evident if we consider that, while external unity is of the nature of an ordinance, internal unity is of the nature of duty. It is the matter of probation even as chastity, meekness, personal consistency, and the like. It admits, therefore, of degrees; it may be more or less perfect: or, again, it is as the health of the body compared with its organic structure: or, again, as the internal peace of a family compared with its hereditary lineage, its primogeniture, paternal authority, and the like. Now God has secured none of these things absolutely. They are the subject-matter of trial and contingent possession; and, therefore, the analogy of His works forbids us to look for subjective unity as an inseparable condition of the Church. And what the analogy of God's works would lead us to expect, the testimony of God's word confirms to us. Scripture contains neither pledge nor promise that the moral Unity of the Church shall not be broken. Nay, the divisions in the Corinthian Church prove the reverse. Unity is a duty: it is the subject of admonition, exhortation, and prayer. It was the subject of the prayer of our blessed Lord, which is not, therefore, frustrated and refused because His Church has from time to time forfeited His inward peace. His prayers on earth and His intercession in heaven are both in harmony with the laws of man's moral probation. Our Lord prayed that His disciples might be one, yet Paul and Barnabas parted asunder in conten-

tion. He prayed that they might be led into all truth, and yet Peter and Barnabas dissembled at Antioch. And what we thus find confirmed by Scripture, we find also proved, in fact, by history; but of this we shall speak hereafter in its own place.

God has promised that His one Church shall be always visible, not that it shall be always internally united. The parables of the wheat and the tares, and of the good fish and the bad, are prophecies that there shall always be the elements of moral division. That these should for a time prevail is according to the nature of probation, and the experience of the Church from the beginning. A body always visibly one, though not always morally one, there shall be even to the end of the world. "There is no security for unity, except as the Church is declared by the promises of God, which, being built on a hill, cannot be hid."[1] Therefore St. Augustin urges on all good men the duty of bearing with the mixture and fellowship of the wicked, and the guilt of separating from the Church on the plea of withdrawing from evil men.[2] It is certain that, as the mastery of disease brings on death, and the dominion of sinful habits ends in apostacy, so the absolute prevalence of internal division must terminate in a forfeiture even of the objective Unity of the Church. It is by moral decline that the churches of Christ first fit themselves for excision from the one body: in the

[1] S. Aug. contra Ep. Parmen. lib. iii. 5. [2] Ib.

end they may be left without the very being or rudiments of the Church.

Now, from all that has been said, it follows as a sort of corollary that in the objective Unity of the Church, and in no other way, is salvation offered to mankind. But as this is a subject of great extent and difficulty, it must be reserved for a separate chapter, which, in the order of this argument, will find its natural place at the beginning of the third part.

CONCLUSION.

From what has been said in the last three chapters we may deduce some general conclusions, and thus bring this portion of the subject to an end. My endeavour has been to show what moral purposes the Church of God, and especially that particular character of it with which we are chiefly concerned, was designed to effect. Although it is unsafe to assume this or that particular result to be the end of the Divine conduct, yet the great axiom, that infinite Wisdom never acts without a purpose, is so much the more commandingly self-evident in the scheme of man's redemption, that we cannot do amiss in seeking from God Himself a knowledge of His final purposes; and this we have done by taking Holy Scripture as our guide in the inquiry. It has been made evident, I trust, that in the whole institution and character of the Church, God has a complex moral end in view; that the probation of man, the recovery of the Divine image in his moral being, the restoration of the true knowledge of the one God to the world, and, through this concatenation of means, the glory of His holy Name, is the

aim and intention of the Divine Author and Ruler of the Church. I have endeavoured further to show how this aim and intention is subserved and accomplished by the character of unity in particular.

I have the more strongly insisted upon this point because there is a direct tendency in the human mind to assume, almost unconsciously, that we sufficiently understand the whole scope and bearing of God's dealings as to be able to estimate the comparative importance of the several parts, and their obligation upon our consciences in the shape of duty. Hardly anything is more common than to hear men arguing that this or that portion of the Divine economy might have been otherwise, that it is an accident or non-essential, that it is separable from the moral idea of redemption, that it is the external form, the mere shell of the system. The effect of such language is to lead other minds, and, insensibly, our own, first to undervalue, next altogether to fail of seeing, the true design of God in the particular features of His dispensation: then to assume that what seems to us without a moral purpose is mutable; that it might be changed, under certain conditions; that it may be dispensed with, under the actual present conditions in which we find ourselves or others to be; and, lastly, that what may be formally dispensed with, may be, under a plea of necessity, informally broken through. Now the first fault in this accumulating error is the assumption that we so far know the mind of God as to distinguish be-

tween what is necessary and what is accidental, what is moral and what is positive, what is subject to our control, and to what, by a Divine ordinance, we ourselves are subjected. I will give one pregnant instance, among many. The visible polity of the Church is called an external form: it is assumed to be an accident to our participation in Christ, and to our renewal in His likeness. It is said, indeed, that it may not be lightly changed, nor without urgent cause and necessity; but these are mere words. They only break the fall of the sound, for in reason they mean nothing more than that the positive institutions of God are subjected to the will of man, so that if he see necessity (of which necessity he is also to be the judge) he may change or reverse them. It is, in fact, the argument of those who reject the material Sacraments; and, in their mouths alone, it is consistent, and has, whether good or bad, a principle of its own. In others, who hold to the institution and absolute obligation of the Holy Sacraments on all to whom the duty is sufficiently propounded, the argument is a mere confusion and inconsistency, as I shall endeavour to show by the following reasons:—

In the first place, the polity of the Church, including the Apostolical succession as its primary condition, and what is vulgarly called Episcopacy as its aspect or countenance, has been shown to be an organic part of the great phenomenon of objective unity, through which the Holy Spirit works

out, in the moral nature of man, the purpose of the Divine mind. It is to the presence of Christ what the structure of the body is to the living soul. It is so united to Christ, and filled with His quickening spirit, as to partake not more of the character of a moral discipline, imposed upon us as a test of our obedience, than of the individuality of a moral being to whose living energies a material form, though accidental, it may be, in the counsel of his Maker, is necessary to its condition as a creature after it is made. It is therefore the necessary moral means to a given end. They that speak so lightly of it assume that this end is accomplished in some other way, of which no account can be given that will not equally overthrow the doctrine of the Holy Sacraments as means of grace. Assuming that this end is in other ways accomplished, the organic polity of the Church is treated as a development, a bodying forth, an accidental clothing of the mind and principle of Christianity. And here, in fact, is the question:— Is the Church a means to an end, or is it a separable consequence of that end which may be otherwise effected? Are we, by means of the Church, made partakers of Christ; or, being otherwise made partakers of Christ, are we, as it may happen, made partakers of the Church? Or again, are we, by means of Baptism, made partakers of Christ; or, being otherwise made partakers of Christ, are we, as it may be or not, made partakers of Baptism? Baptism is either a means to make us partakers of

Christ, or it is not.[1] If not, then how are we made partakers of Him? If it be, it is so as the door of the Church, the lesser Sacrament opening into the greater, "which is His body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all." And a participation in the Sacrament, so to speak, of the Church is as generally necessary to salvation as a participation in the Sacrament of Baptism. Both are equally binding in their obligation, equally moral in their character, and equally mystical in their energy and effect.

It is scarcely necessary to observe, in the next place, that the polity of the Church is subject to no control or judgment of man; and is absolutely immutable, except by the authority of God alone.

It would be hardly possible that any one, with the whole typical analogy of the Elder Church in Holy Scripture before his eyes, should have ventured on the thought of its mutableness, if he were not first to assume that the organic polity of the Church is not a means to any moral and mystical end; or to imagine that he can discover the fulfilment of all the Divine mind in the moral condition of those Christian communities which have made forfeit of their inheritance in the one visible Church. I say he could not venture to assert that an appointed means to a transcendent end, and that too of a moral and mystical kind, could be mutable to man, who is himself to be the subject of its operations.

[1] See the Catechism and the Baptismal Office of the Church of England.

This would be a fancy of the imagination like his of whom the prophet says, "He maketh a god, and worshippeth it: he maketh it a graven image, and falleth down thereto."[1] Surely their intellectual error is no less gross who change the polity of the body of Christ, and set up a system devised by the wit and moulded by the will of man, and call it a Church. It would be a mere will-worship to submit to it. And further, it is to be remembered that this error is not a calm theory, drawn out by *à priori* likelihood, or propounded as a probable speculation by unbiassed minds; but it is a scheme wrung out, by an after-effort, from the difficulties in which men entangle themselves, and is the self-justifying retrospect of minds already pledged to make a case. But into this we cannot enter now: it is mentioned only to lay bare the weakness and unsoundness of the scheme.

It only remains to affirm, on the strength of all that has been said, that the One Holy Catholic Church is an institution divine in its original, and sacramental in its character: that is, moral, mystical, immutable, and necessary to the salvation of all to whom it is sufficiently propounded.

And with this conclusion we may leave the second part of the subject.

[1] Isaiah xliv. 14, 15.

PART III.

THE

DOCTRINE OF CATHOLIC UNITY APPLIED

TO THE

ACTUAL STATE OF CHRISTENDOM.

CHAPTER I.

THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH THE ONLY REVEALED WAY OF SALVATION.

In the first Part of this work I endeavoured to show the nature of the Unity of the Church considered as a matter of fact: in the second, I attempted to ascertain its idea and moral design: in this third and last Part, I shall go on to examine what may be called the faults or anomalies in the actual state of the Church as compared with the doctrine of unity here laid down.

But I would not be thought to do so for the purpose of adding fresh proof to what has been before established. The doctrine stands upon its own positive evidence. By this it must stand or fall. It is equally irregular either to affirm or to object on apparent *à posteriori* arguments. The proof of the principle lies in the first Part: its moral import in the second; and my intention is to apply it in

the last, on which we are now entering. The application of the principle, however, is of no small moment, for it will be found that almost all popular objections to the Catholic doctrine of unity are drawn from the supposed difficulties which result on applying the rule to the existing state of Christendom. It is thought to disinherit of their portion in the One Church many large bodies of Christian people; to invest with this inestimable birthright a larger body who are deemed to have fainter traces of the ancestral character; and to render doubtful the legitimacy of our own Catholic and Apostolic branch of the one true Church.

Into all these several topics we shall enter in due order; and that we may do so with the fullest apprehension of the principle before us, I will take up a point which was dropped at the end of the last, and reserved for the present Part.

We there saw that in the objective Unity of the Church, and in no other way, is salvation offered to mankind;[1] or, in other words, that the One Holy Catholic Church is an institution divine in its original, and sacramental in its character—that is, moral, mystical, and immutable, and necessary to the salvation of all to whom it is sufficiently propounded.

In bringing this principle to bear on the actual state of the world, we are met by two remarkable phenomena: the one, that to two-thirds of all man-

[1] Page 283.

kind this revealed way of salvation has never been proposed at all; the other, that of the remaining third, a large body, perhaps nearly one-sixth of the whole, do not belong to the visible Unity of the Church. If, then, the one only Church be the one only way of salvation, what must we believe of their condition before God? This question has so many aspects and so many shades of difference, that no one general answer can be given. We must, therefore, carefully distinguish the several forms of the question, and reply to each in order.

And, first, of the great majority of mankind to whom this way of salvation has never been proposed at all. It is plain that we need not dwell long on this part of the subject. This mystery in the dealings of God is a stumbling-block to the Deist and the Infidel, but to no Catholic Christian. To him, indeed, it is an inscrutable secret at variance with his own anticipations. But Holy Scripture throws lights enough, if it be only athwart the difficulty, to indicate the solution. In the ages before Christ's coming, it is evident that God had true servants known to Himself scattered abroad throughout the world. Such was the condition of men in the patriarchal times down to the call of Abraham. And after this peculiar investiture of one family, God did not withdraw himself from men of other nations. The history of Job and of his friends is a sufficient proof of this. The vision of warning to Abimelech; the dreams of Pharoah

and Nebuchadnezzar, and the history of Balaam, are all evidences that God held communication with those to whom He intrusted no formal revelation and no positive institutions.[1] So again we find the providential government of God extended over the kingdoms of the heathen. The prophet Jeremiah denounces God's punishment against all nations that would not serve the king of Babylon.[2] St. Paul also asserts that the Gentiles were "a law unto themselves;" and that they should be judged accordingly. The difference between them and the chosen people of God seems to be this. To the Jews was intrusted the office of transmitting and testifying the promise of a Saviour; and to them was given the pledge that He should be born of their lineage after the flesh. And this St. Paul declares when he answers his own question: "What advantage, then, hath the Jew, or what profit is there of circumcision? Much every way. Chiefly because that unto them were committed the oracles of God."[3] They were to the nations what the tribe of Levi was to Israel, the bearers and keepers of the Lord's tabernacle. In like manner, at the first preaching of the Gospel, St. Paul found among the Gentiles at Antioch many that were "disposed to eternal life."[4] And in the city of Corinth the Lord had much people.[5] All these things strongly sup-

[1] See Newman's History of the Arians, 87—91.

[2] Jerem. xxvii. 8. [3] Rom. iii. 1, 2.

[4] Acts xiii. 48. τεταγμένοι. [5] Acts xviii. 10.

port the assertion of Clement of Alexandria already quoted, that God had given many dispensations, one to the Greeks, one to the Jews, and the last to Christians. Now although, by the promulgation of the Gospel, and the universal commission to evangelize all nations, the condition of the Heathen is changed, yet certainly it is not changed for the worse. Because God has intrusted to His Church some better thing for them, He has not therefore withdrawn anything they before enjoyed. We may assume then, at least, that they are as before; and that they, whom the One Church has never gathered into her precinct, may yet be drawn by the One Great Spirit, and saved by the unseen virtue of the One Great Sacrifice. There is nothing in Holy Scripture warranting us to believe that the benefit of the atonement, offered for the sin of the world, is necessarily restricted to those who have explicit offers of salvation. It is revealed, indeed, that there is no other meritorious cause of salvation than the blood-shedding of Christ alone; but we are not told that the relation towards God even of those that never come to a knowledge of redemption may not be altogether changed. But although we may have this hope, the Church is no less bound to go forth and preach to them the one faith, and the only salvation in the one Church of Christ, than if God had openly revealed what He has absolutely kept secret from us—I mean, the rule of His dealings with them. We may hope that

they may be saved; but we do not *know* the manner or the conditions of their salvation. We know one only way; and that they have not. We know that there is "none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved:" that "there is one God, and one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus:" that the ministry of reconciliation was committed to the one Church; to which "the Lord added daily such as should be saved." But beyond this nothing is revealed.

We may now pass on to those with whom we are chiefly concerned, namely, such as have had the One Church sufficiently proposed to them. And of these there are two classes: the one, of those who at once and for ever reject the salvation offered to them; the other, of those who for a time receive it, *i. e.*, they who are never at all in the One Church, and they who, having been members of it, afterwards depart from its unity. Now St. John the Baptist has declared:—"He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him."[1] And St. John the Evangelist:—"He that hath the Son hath life, and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life."[2] And our Blessed Lord Himself:—"He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; and he that believeth not shall be damned."[3]

We may apply this rule, first, to those who have

[1] St. John iii. 36. [2] 1 St. John v. 12. [3] St. Mark xvi. 16.

never at all entered the One Church, even though sufficiently proposed to them. Such were the unbelieving Jews and Heathens in the beginning, and at this day. They rejected the whole mystery of Christ, both the One Sacrifice and the One Church; and their rejection was an act of direct energetic opposition to the will of God. Whether or not any such shall be delivered from the wrath to come we know not. God has revealed nothing more than we have recited above, and that has an awful aspect. He that perfectly knows man's moral state will unerringly discern the shades of moral incapacity, indisposition, and resistance. He will adjust the award according to the probation of each, who, to the eyes of men, seem to have failed in the trial. And here we may leave this subject.

Our chief difficulty lies in the case of those who have been members of the One Church, but are again separate from it. And of these there are many classes. There are some whose separation may be said to be involuntary, such as persons excommunicated by an act of the Church herself; and catechumens, who are as yet kept without by her authority; and others, whose separation is voluntary, such as heretics and schismatics, who sever themselves by an act of their own.

Now of excommunicate persons, also, there are many grades, such as those who are finally and for ever cut off from the Unity of the Church for the greatness or the iteration of their sins. Of such

the Church pronounces that she is unable any more to assure them of God's mercy; and so she leaves them to God's inscrutable judgment: such again are those whose separation is of a corrective or penitential kind, being terminable and with a view to restoration, after one, five, ten, twenty years, or by the communication of the Holy Eucharist even on a death-bed.[1] In all these cases the Church by her act indicates hope "that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus."[2] Indeed, all such persons may be said to belong to the Unity of the Church, though the enjoyment of their inheritance is for their chastisement suspended, as Canaan was the inheritance of the Jews, when, for their unbelief, they were turned back to wander forty years in the wilderness. Of catechumens, also, it may be believed that they are in the Church in desire and intention, though not in fact, and, dying in that state, shall as surely be saved[3] as the penitent thief to whom the sacrament of regeneration, through the impossibility of the case, was wanting.[4]

We now come to those whose separation is voluntary.

And first of heretics. The matter of heresy is denial of the faith: the form of it a pertinacious denial after sufficient admonition. It is evident, therefore, that errors in doctrine are not neces-

[1] Bingham, Orig. Eccl. B. xix. c. i. s. 3. [2] 1 Cor. v. 5.
[3] Bellarmin. de Ecclesiâ milit. lib. iii. c. 3, 5.
[4] S. Aug. de Baptismo, lib. iv. xxii. xxiii.

sarily heretical: for the error may be in some mere theological opinion, or in some point undetermined by the Church, or, even if determined, through error of fact in the man who denies it.[1] The matter of heresy, therefore, may be said to be denial of the Baptismal Creed, or any part of it, on condition of believing which a man is made partaker of Christ in baptism, and a member of the Catholic Church.[2] It is evident also that a man through error of fact, or through want of right knowledge, for the communication of which others are responsible, may hold erroneously some articles even of the Baptismal Creed. Yet if he hold them to himself he is no heretic.[3] So again even though he propound his error, yet, if not sufficiently admonished by the Church, he is no heretic:[4] nor even if, when admonished, he should without pertinacity, or persevering in the publication of his error, remain in confusion and perplexity.[5] But after separating off all these several gradations of error, there will yet remain the pertinacious denial of the baptismal faith, after due admonition, which is both material and formal heresy, and is equivalent in its moral character to an original rejection of

[1] Palmer's Treatise on the Church, vol. i. pp. 104, 108.

[2] Laud's Conference with Fisher, p. 27, fol. 1686.

[3] Ib. pp. 205, 206.

[4] S. Aug. de Bapt. contra Donat.: "Istum nondum hæreticum dico, nisi manifestatâ sibi doctrinâ Catholicæ fidei resistere maluerit." lib. iv. xvi.

[5] S. Aug. Ep. xliii. tom. ii. 88, ed. Ben.

Baptism, which on the condition of that profession was at the first administered. The heretic puts himself into a state in which the Church would have been bound to refuse the Sacrament of Holy Baptism. Even Simon Magus believed or professed to believe according to the tenour of this necessary condition. Heresy is therefore an active opposition to the authority of the Church of God as a teacher of Divine truth.

The other class we have to consider are schismatics. And this is a far simpler question, for schism consists not so much in an intention as in a matter of fact. There are, it may be, men of a temper far more schismatical in the Unity of the Church than in a state of separation from it; for, indeed, the ultimate and highest form of schism is an energetic opposition to the authority of God ruling in His Church. But it is not necessary to suppose that every act of schism is prompted by such a conscious temper; though in all cases it is involved implicitly in the fact, be the agent never so unconscious. The proximate motive, however, is often some inferior form of indocility, impatience, resentment against the person of those that bear authority, self-elation, mortified vanity, and the like. Nevertheless, whatsoever may be the motive in the heart of the separatist, his act is a visible rending of a visible unity, and as such is in all cases schismatical. By its very nature it cannot be latent, as heresy: it promulges itself in its first

beginnings; and publicity is inseparable from its continuance. When a man ceases to show himself in places of schismatical worship and conference, he has, in all exterior senses, ceased to be a schismatic; and the active habit of schism is at an end. So long as it is continued, the man as fully deprives himself of the Sacraments of Christ as if he had never entered the Catholic Church. He cuts off the ordained channels of grace between Christ and his soul as absolutely as if he had never drawn nigh to them. He has proclaimed, so far as his individual acts avails, an entire suspension of intercourse between heaven and earth. It is not necessary that I should speak of the moral evil which flows as a consequence from his act. We are concerned with his personal state alone. All that we can say is, that we know of no way by which he can be saved but through the Church only, and that this way he has rejected. We have already seen how strongly and broadly the Catholic doctrine, that out of the one Church there is no salvation, was taught in the first ages.

It is always to be observed that this is a declaration, not a judicial doctrine. It testifies affirmatively the Revelation of God, but does not venture to decide the ultimate award of any living soul. All that it declares is, that out of the Church there is no revealed way of salvation. It does not say that there is no inscrutable working of God's Spirit, no actual saving of moral beings. The

Catholic sense of this doctrine may be expressed in the following propositions :—

First. That God has revealed no other way of salvation but by faith in Christ.

Secondly. That He has committed the ministry of reconciliation, that is, of interceding with Him, and of assuring mankind of pardon, to no other body than the one Church.

Thirdly. That to no other body on earth has been intrusted a Divine commission to witness the mysteries of Revelation, or to administer the Sacraments of Grace.

Fourthly. That no other body is ordained of God to be the moral discipline restoring the Divine image to the soul of man.

Fifthly. That no other body on earth is divinely set for the moral probation, for the rising and falling of mankind.

And lastly. As a consequence from all these, that they who separate themselves from it, separate themselves from the way of probation, the moral discipline, the Sacraments of grace, the witness of truth, the ministry of reconciliation, and the only revealed way of partaking in the sacrifice of Christ.

This will be more simply evident if we consider that faith in Christ is a moral and practical habit; that the Unity of the Church is the line of obedience marked out by Christ for our faith to follow. And faith without obedience is a moral contradiction. And here we may take a distinction

recognised by Catholic writers, and most expressly taught by St. Augustin, namely, that there is a difference, perceptible to the moral judgment, though not to the senses, between the Catholic Church and the mystical body of Christ. It must not for a moment be supposed that this distinction in any way countenances the error of those who have fancied to themselves a visible and an invisible Church on earth, so as in effect to divide the One Church into two.[1] The distinction above made is between things distinguishable but not divided (entia interdistincta sed indivisa), as the body and soul of an individual man, or the symbol and grace of a sacrament, or a moral nature and a moral habit. The visible Church is the one body of men united by the profession of the same faith, and by communion in the same sacraments, under the jurisdiction of their lawful pastors.[2] In this definition there are three parts. By the profession of a true faith all Heathens, Jews, and Heretics are excluded; by the communion of sacraments all excommunicated persons and catechumens not yet admitted; by the jurisdiction of lawful pastors all schismatics, even though they hold to the doctrines of Christianity. There are included in the definition all other persons, even though they be evil and reprobate men. Therefore no internal virtues are required to constitute any man a member of

[1] Field on the Church, b. i. c. 10.

[2] Bellarm. de defin. Eccl. lib. iii. 2, 9.

the One Church, but only an external profession of the faith, a participation in the sacraments, and a subjection to the lawful jurisdiction of the Church. The Church, therefore, is a body of men visible and palpable as the body of the Roman people, or the kingdom of France, or the republic of Venice.[1] And yet, though no internal virtues are required to constitute any man a member of the One Church, all graces and virtues, such as faith, hope, and charity, are enshrined in the Church; but not so as to constitute a Church within a Church, so making two, but as parts or properties of the One Church. The distinction, then, taken by St. Augustin is as follows:—"That the Church is a living system in which there is soul and body; the soul is the inward gift of the Holy Ghost, faith, hope, charity, &c.; the body the external profession of the faith and participation of the sacraments. Whence it follows that some belong both to the soul and to the body of the Church, and so are united to Christ the head both outwardly and inwardly, and they belong to the Church in the most perfect manner; for they are, as it were, living members in the body, although they partake, some more and some less, of life, and some have only so much as the beginning of life, having, as it were, sense but not motion, such, for instance, as have only faith without charity. Again, some are of the soul, but not of the body, as cate-

[1] Bellarm. de defin. Eccl. sect. 10.

chumens, and excommunicate persons, if they have faith and charity, which is possible. Lastly, some are of the body and not of the soul, as they who have no inward virtue, and yet from some hope or worldly fear profess the faith and communicate in the sacraments under the jurisdiction of lawful pastors."[1] And these are as diseases, or bad humours in the human body. The rule drawn from this distinction by St. Augustin may be collected from the following passages. Speaking of the mixture of good and evil men in the visible Church, and correcting an unexact mode of defining it, he says: "This rule may be called the rule concerning the mixed Church; which rule demands a watchful reader, when Scripture, although it is already speaking to others, seems still to speak to those whom it was before addressing, or concerning those of whom it was before speaking, as if the body of both sorts were one by reason of the commixture in this life and joint participation of the sacraments."[2] "That Church which has now a mixture of evil men is not different from the kingdom of God, where there shall be no admixture of the wicked, but one and the very same holy Church now under one, hereafter under another condition, now having evil

[1] Bellarm. de defin. Eccl. sect. ii. Bellarmin refers only to the Breviculus Collationis, &c., No. 3, where indeed this doctrine is strongly affirmed. It is, however, much more clearly and variously illustrated in St. Augustin's other works against the Donatists, as cited in the text.

[2] De doctrinâ Christianâ, lib. iii. c. 32.

men mingled in it, then having none; as now it is mortal, because made up of mortal men, then immortal, because there shall be in it no one who can die, even so much as after the flesh, any more; as there are not therefore two Christs, because He first died and afterwards dieth no more. The same way of speaking is used of the outward and inward man, which though they be diverse, cannot be called two men; how much less can it be called two Churches when they are the very same saints who now endure the wicked, who are mingled with them, and die to rise again; but then shall have no wicked mingled with them, and shall never die any more."[1] "In the Song of Songs the Church is thus described: 'A garden enclosed, my sister, my spouse, a fountain sealed, a well of living water, a Paradise with the fruit of apples.' This I dare not understand, save of the holy and just, not of the covetous, and fraudulent, and thieves, and usurers, and drunkards, and envious men, who, nevertheless, have a common baptism with the just, with whom they have not a common charity. . . . . Are these then the thorns in the midst of which she (the beloved) is as a lily, as is said in the same Song? In so far as she is a lily, she is also a garden enclosed, and a fountain sealed: that is, in those just ones who are Jews in secret by the circumcision of the heart (for all the beauty of the King's daughter is within), in whom is the certain

[1] Brevic. Coll. cont. Don. iii. x.

number of saints predestined before the world was made. . . . . There are also some even of that number who still live wickedly, or lie sunk in heresies and heathen superstitions, and yet even there 'the Lord knoweth them that are His;' for in that infallible foreknowledge of God, many who seem without are within, and many who seem within are without. Of all those therefore who, so to speak, are inwardly and in secret within, consists that 'garden enclosed, that fountain sealed, that well of living water, that Paradise with the fruit of apples.' To these belong the gifts vouchsafed of God, in part exclusively, as in this world unwearied charity, and in the world to come life everlasting; but, in part, in common with the evil and perverse, as all other gifts, among which are also the Holy mysteries."[1] Speaking of those who had received Baptism among heretics, and were afterwards reconciled to the Church, he says, "It may therefore be that some who are baptized without, through the foreknowledge of God, are reputed rather as baptized within, because there (*i. e.*, in the Church) the water first began to avail for their salvation; for neither in any other way can they be said to be saved in the ark but by water. And again, some who seem to be baptized within, by the same foreknowledge of God, are more truly reputed to be baptized without; forasmuch as, through abuse of Baptism, they perish by water, which then

[1] De Bapt. contra Don. lib. v. xxvii. and vi. iii.

befell none but those that were without the ark. Certainly it is plain that what is said of within and without in the Church, must be understood of the heart, not of the body; forasmuch as all who are within in heart are saved in the unity of the ark by the same water, by which all who are without in heart, whether without in body also or not, perish as enemies of unity."[1] So in another place:—"According to His foreknowledge, who knoweth whom He predestinated, before the world was made, to be conformed to the image of His Son, many also who are openly without, and are called heretics, are better than many, and they good Catholics."[2] And again:—"According to the foreknowledge of God, as many sheep wander without, so many wolves prowl within."[3] I will add only one more most remarkable passage, which will complete our outline of St. Augustin's distinction. On the 10th chapter of St. John he says, "According to the foreknowledge and predestination of God, how many sheep are without, how many wolves within; and how many sheep within, how many wolves without. What did I say? How many sheep without! How many now live in sensuality who shall be chaste; how many blaspheme Christ who shall believe in Christ; how many drink themselves drunken who shall be sober; how many rob others of their goods who shall give away their own: but now for a time

[1] De Bapt. contra Don. v. xxviii.
[2] De Bapt. iv. iii. [3] Ibid. lib. vi. i.

they hear the voice of others, and follow others. Also, how many within give praise who shall blaspheme; are chaste, who shall defile themselves; are sober, who shall drown themselves in drink; who stand, but shall fall: they are not sheep."[1]

Now, upon these passages we may observe,—

First, that St. Augustin contrasts the diametrical moral opposites of good and evil men within and without the Church.

Secondly, that he contrasts, with equal clearness, the diametrical opposition of the visible state of those that are or are not members of the Church. *Good* and *evil* are not more contrasted by him than *within* and *without*.

Thirdly, that he also uses the terms "within" and "without" in a figurative sense, *i. e.*, in heart, but not in body: "*corde sed non corpore*."

Fourthly, that he recognizes within the visible Church an invisible communion of saints.

And, lastly, that he believed in a moral Providence working out the predestinated results of the foreseen probation of man.

Now all this may be resolved up into the one principle already insisted on, namely, that the one visible Church is of the nature of a sacrament, both representing and making men partakers of the salvation which is in Christ, namely, forgiveness through his blood-shedding and restoration to His image. The distinction, therefore, between the

[1] In S. Joan. Ev. cx. line iii. pt. ii. 600.

visible Church and the invisible communion of saints is no more than the distinction between *potentiality* and *actuality*. All members of the visible Church are regenerate in holy baptism; they are in the first disposition towards the mind of Christ; they are saints *in posse*. Even those whose lives are openly profane and evil, until in God's mysterious economy of probation they justly forfeit the capability of recovery,[1] are of the nature of saints. I say of the nature, because though they are capable of the energies and habits of holiness, they do not possess them. They hold their capability in unrighteousness; but they who by docile following of the spirit of God become holy in energy and habit, are saints *in esse*, in realized and actual holiness. They are one with Christ by a conscious moral choice, by the deliberate election of the conscience, and by the fast cleaving of the heart. Their wills are energetically one with His will; and they are partakers of an incorporation and co-adunation of body, soul, and spirit, which transcends the sense and understanding. To take, once more, an illustration often used already. The one visible Church is to this invisible communion what the visible partakers of the blessed Eucharist are to the invisible fellowship of those who verily and indeed receive the body and blood of Christ: they are the elect fruit of the elect vine, the ripeness of the regenerate seed. And this blessed company

[1] Heb. vi. 4, 5, 6.

make up the true mystical body of Christ,[1] of which the visible Church is but the symbol and ministrative cause, subordinate to the spirit of God. We have now made good a distinction which will serve as a principle to adjust in some measure the phenomena of Christendom with the doctrine here laid down.

We must revert once more to the distinction of unity into objective and subjective, and take in order the anomalies which are found without and within the Church of Christ. We will consider first the case of those who have wholly forfeited the objective unity both in doctrine and discipline; then of those who have made a partial forfeit; that is, first, of the doctrine, retaining the discipline, secondly, of the discipline, retaining the doctrine; and next, the state of those who have retained the objective unity both in doctrine and discipline, but have lost the subjective unity of communion and intercourse.

[1] Stapleton, quoted by Field, on the Church, p. 17.

CHAPTER II.

THE LOSS OF OBJECTIVE UNITY.

THE first case we have to consider is the case of those who have wholly forfeited the objective unity both of doctrine and discipline. Such, for instance, are the sects who have rejected the mystery of the proper Godhead of our Lord Jesus Christ; and those who have rejected the Holy Sacraments.

In the first place we may observe that these sects are not necessarily formal, but only material, heretics. The first originators of their error were guilty of the heresy and the schism; but their descendants have inherited their actual state without partaking necessarily of its moral cause. It is, indeed, true that, as each man grows up to the full development of his personal responsibility, he may appropriate to himself the act of his forefathers by his own direct conscious act of moral consent and choice. He may also pertinaciously defend his error against sufficient admonition. But it is possible—indeed, almost certain—that among the descendants of the first propounders of the delusion, there are many whose moral nature

has never been exercised by any form of probation in the matter of their error. At every remove from the first impulse the momentum of active participation declined. In a few generations it was exhausted; and their successors inherited a corrupt tradition, rather with passive acquiescence than with conscious approval. By this involuntary apostasy a grave injury was inflicted on their moral being. The bias of their mind was insensibly and involuntarily determined to a false idea. Their free disposition, which should have been reserved for the impressions of truth, was pre-occupied by error; and their intellectual nature received false stamps and characters, and erroneous inclinations. No one can say how deep and lasting an injury is wrought in the texture of the human mind, when its first action is to coalesce with delusion and falsehood. It seems to sear and to distort it almost beyond recovery. With this moral indisposition come also intellectual hindrances. The constant action of a false system, and the absolute exclusion of truth, make ignorance invincible. Oftentimes they may have never heard a surmise of any form of truth except their own inherited belief; or they have heard of it only with contempt and opposition. Their better feelings are enlisted in a warfare against truth, conceived to be falsehood. All these are mitigating pleas in their moral probation. Add to these the spiritual penury to which they were born, the moral destitution of their fathers' home; no witness for truth, no sacraments of grace,

no gentle suasion, and moulding pressure of a spiritual discipline; and there can hardly be conceived an immortal being in a state more impoverished and desolate.

Now, nothing can be more certain than that among such sects there are to be found many approximations to the reality of Christian life. We find a solid morality, a great love of truth so far as it is known, real self-denial, energy and zeal in works of benevolence, and uprightness of conscience before God. Of these there are abundant instances; so many and so visible, indeed, as to betray some minds, more active than enlarged, into a theory that the common measure of everyday temptations is reduced in their case by the Enemy of Truth, whose cause their very virtues tend to serve. Although this may be among his arch-devices, yet it will not account for the undeniable forms of obedience in those who escape from his dominion. There can be but one only Author of good in them; that is, the same who out of the moral anarchy even of the regenerate educes the unseen unity of saints. Wheresoever we see forms of Christian obedience among those who have lost the doctrine and discipline of the Church, they are so many moral miracles: they are revelations in *fact;* which are, therefore, no way contrary to God's revelation in *word.* He has promised to sanctify man through His Church; He has not declared that He will sanctify none in other ways. Through His Church

we know both the conditions and the means; beyond His Church we know neither: yet who is he that shall deny a visible fact because he cannot see *how* God has done it, and yet believe in sacraments and miracles? The wisdom of God is manifold; and of all the ways of bringing about the same end, He has revealed but one. And while we know of no other, and can trust ourselves to no other, and dare teach men to rely on no other, yet we may well believe He has reserved many more ways in His own power. We who see men under the energy of God's Spirit without His sacraments, may well hope that they shall partake of salvation without His Church. It is in accordance with all that God has revealed of Himself to believe that, in His moral government over His moral creatures, He proceeds by the broad rule of natural equity, on which even His supernatural economy is grounded; and that the virtues of the one all-atoning Sacrifice prevail even for those who by no act of their own have been disinherited of their portion in His visible Church. That they belong to the body of the Church is contrary to all evidence and testimony of the Prophets, Apostles, and of Christ Himself. That by His merciful and mysterious working, who knits in one the mystical company of saints, they are made unconscious partakers of the soul of the one Church, is no less accordant with the first axioms of the illuminated reason, than with the tender mercies of God.

We must now consider the case of those who

have forfeited only in part the objective Unity of the Church; and first, those who have in part forfeited the unity of doctrine, but retained the discipline.

The Nestorian, and Monophysite, and Monothelite churches in Egypt, Abyssinia, Syria, Armenia, and the East, may be taken as instances. These churches ceased to communicate with the Universal Church after the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon. The forfeiture of objective doctrine related in both cases to the mode of the Incarnation of our Lord. The errors were both of a speculative kind, but in their inferential consequences of a practical effect. They were condemned by œcumenical synods, and pertinaciously maintained by those Churches; and the result was a breach of communion. What, then, is the condition of these bodies? Do they, or do they not, belong to the One Church? They forfeited the truth in one primary article of faith; but they retained the Apostolical Succession of orders, and the transmitted power to perform all functions contained in the ministerial character. Now it must be considered, first, that the objective unity of doctrine and discipline is a deposit intrusted by Christ to His Church; and "it is required of stewards that a man be found faithful."[1] It is the probation of the churches that they should keep this deposit whole and undefiled. The Nestorian and Monophysite Churches were

[1] 1 Cor. iv. 2.

found untrusty in one leading feature of their charge: as stewards they were proved unfaithful: they were condemned by the judgment of the Catholic Church; and they returned this sentence by anathema. Since that time they have stood aloof, handing on unchanged the tradition of a mutilated faith.

As, then, the being of the Church consists in an objective system, instituted and ordained of God, it must be admitted that these churches, by forfeiting one portion of it, have forfeited their inheritance in the unity of the one visible body. Their condemnation, and the suspension of communion which followed, were the consequences of their forfeiture. This, and not what may be called the judicial award, is the cause of their abscission. So much for their formal condition.

We must now consider their moral state. It in no way derogates from the force and exactness of the dogma that in the One Church alone there is salvation, to believe that God may and does from these mutilated churches gather out many unto everlasting life. The reasons of this hope or judgment of the heart are manifold: as, first, that one of the moral ends of the Church itself is the salvation of mankind. We may well believe, therefore, that the merciful purpose of God, declared in the election of these Eastern nations to regeneration through His Church, shall not be wholly turned aside. That they were once members of the One

Church is a recorded witness of God's good will towards them. And can we doubt that He who looked in mercy on Nineveh, a heathen city, and Himself pleaded for their salvation with his over-zealous prophet, saying, "Thou hast had pity on the gourd, for the which thou hast not laboured, neither madest it grow; which came up in a night and perished in a night: and should not I spare Nineveh, that great city, wherein are more than six score thousand persons that cannot discern between their right hand and their left hand; and also much cattle?"[1]—can we doubt, I say, that He who chose out those people by the predestination of His grace to the salvation which is in Christ, who planted and tended them well nigh four hundred years, and from them gathered precious fruits in their season, should still look with a stedfast eye of mercy on the hundreds of thousands among them who could not discern their right hand from their left? First it must be remembered that, in the original breach, the responsible agents were those to whom the government of the churches was committed, and with them such also as consciously partook of their false teaching and pertinacious schism. But how many moral beings, children and women, simple and unlearned people, whose chief sin was too great docility, were unconsciously and passively involved in the consequence of this breach, God alone can know. We are forced at the outset to

[1] Jonah iv. 10, 11.

believe that He was more merciful to them than their natural pastors. It is the light of faith shining in the reason that leads us to believe that multitudes in these lapsed churches yet belonged, in spirit and in truth, to the soul of the one true Church: they belonged to it in preparation of heart, in conscious intention, and in stedfast though erroneous belief.

We may next observe that, as multitudes were guiltlessly involved in the first breach, so their children were born to be the inheritors of a state which was not imputed as a sin even to their parents; and further, that of those whose forefathers had by conscious assent become partakers of the schism, the moral state was widely different. The sins of parents cleave to their children in the way of penal consequence; but the children are not necessarily partakers by direct moral consent; they may become so, and often do; but, in the case of churches which fall as landslips from the Church Universal, there must be, in all ages, many who represent the simple and unlearned of the first generation which was passively rent from the visible body; and who to the simplicity and unlearned docility of their forefathers add the accumulated unconsciousness of the evils which attach to their inherited condition. If there be any truth in the rule that moral guilt grows less at every remove from the first authors of a schism, it must hold good in such a case.

We now come to another question contained in

this form of the case, namely, whether or no the discipline which is retained entire, including the orders and sacraments of Christ, be valid and effectual to the engrafting of men into Him and the sustaining of communion with Him? The negative arguments are either that the apostolical authority is annulled by heresy, or that it is suspended by the schism.

Now on this subject the judgment and practice of the Church has varied; and by its variations has shown that there was no fixed and immutable rule. The Greek Church in earlier times admitted the orders of heretics, whom in later times she was wont to reordain: the Latin Church seems almost invariably to have admitted the orders of such heretics as used the Catholic rite, and had themselves derived orders from the Church.[1] Pope Felix was ordained by Arians.[2] In the East, the Nestorians, Eutychians, Severians, Jacobites, and Acephali were received upon a simple condemnation of their heresy and its author. They neither rebaptized nor reordained them.[3] Of the Nestorians St. Gregory writes: "Let them anathematize Nestorius with all his followers, and other heretics: let them promise to receive also the venerable synods which the Universal Church receives, and without doubt receive them into the Church,

[1] Morinus de Sacr. Ord. pars iii. exerc. v. c. xi. sect. 5.
[2] Mason's Vindic. of the Engl. Min. p. 154, fol. 1728.
[3] Morinus, ib. c. xii. s. 17.

preserving to them their own orders."[1] So also were the Arians received;[2] so also the Pelagians were treated by the judgment of St. Leo;[3] so also were the Monothelites dealt with by the seventh synod.[4] It is evident, then, that the succession and orders of these churches, although deemed unlawful as being contrary to the canons, were held to be valid as being conferred by men validly consecrated, and by a rite containing all things essential to the sacramental nature of holy orders.

Now in respect to baptism the question is of an easier kind. After the great controversy respecting schismatical baptism, which many of the Eastern Churches held with the African to be invalid,[5] it was finally ruled, in the West, that Baptism conferred with the right form, matter, and intention was to be accounted valid.[6] This recognition of Baptism did not involve a recognition of orders in the administrator. Even in cases where the orders were held to be null, the Sacrament of Baptism was accepted.[7] They degraded the clergy, but received the laity with the chrism only. As this is a question of some moment, it may be well to state explicitly the reason of this rule as it is given by St. Augustin. It must always, however, be borne in mind that he is writing, not of laymen, but of those who had de-

[1] Morinus de Sacr. c. xi. s. 1.
[2] S. Hierom. Dial. contr. Lucif. [3] Morinus, iii. c. x. s. 8.
[4] Ib. c. xi. s. 2. [5] Ib. c. xii. s. 4, 5.
[6] Hooker, Eccl. Pol. v. c. 58. s. [3]. Ed. Keble.
[7] Courayer's Defence of the English Ordinations, pp. 294, 295.

rived orders from the Catholic Church. He says, "that the Baptism of Christ cannot be annulled by any perversity of man, whether he be the giver or the receiver of it;" and immediately adds, that the reason why the bishops or pastors in St. Cyprian's time had doubted the validity of the Baptism given by heretics and schismatics was "because the Sacrament was not distinguished from its effect and use. And because the effect and use of the Sacrament—namely, in liberation from sins and uprightness of heart—was not found among heretics, the Sacrament itself was thought not to be there. But when they turned their eyes to the multitude of chaff within the Church, they also who, in the unity of it, are perverse and live evil lives, would seem neither to have power to give, nor even to have, remission of sins, because not to the evil, but to the good sons it was said, 'whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto him, and whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained;' it was sufficiently clear to the pastors of the Catholic Church diffused throughout the world, by whom afterwards the original custom was confirmed with the authority of a plenary council, that they nevertheless may have, and give, and receive the Sacrament of Baptism; that also a sheep, which was wandering without, and had received the Lord's mark from its deceitful spoilers without, when it comes to the salvation of Christian unity, is to be corrected of its error, freed from its bondage, healed of its wound,

but the Lord's mark upon it is to be rather acknowledged than rejected, forasmuch as many, who are ostensibly within, but are themselves indeed wolves, imprint the very same mark upon wolves like unto themselves."[1] And a little after he adds, "I say that both good and bad may have, may give, and may receive the Sacrament of Baptism; the good, indeed, usefully and unto health, but the bad hurtfully and penally, since that (the Sacrament) is equally perfect in each; and its equal integrity in all is not affected by how much worse the man may be who has it among the evil, as neither by how much better the man may be who has it among the good. And for this reason it is not affected by how much worse he be who gives it, as neither by how much better; nor by how much worse he be who receives it, as neither by how much better; for the Sacrament itself, both in those that are not equally righteous and in those that are not equally unrighteous, is itself equally holy."[2] St. Augustin's argument is this: the unworthiness of the minister does not destroy the integrity of the Sacrament; there are wolves within as without; heresy and schism without the Church are as sin and an evil life within it; as these do not annul it, so neither do the other faults. But he is speaking of ordained men in both cases. "For it is the Sacrament of Baptism which he has who is baptised, and it is the Sacrament of conferring Baptism which he has who is

[1] De Bapt. contra Don. vi. 1. [2] Ib. sect. 2.

ordained. And as he who is baptized, if he depart from unity, does not lose the Sacrament of Baptism, so he that is ordained, if he depart from unity, does not lose the Sacrament of conferring Baptism."[1] "For both are sacraments; and both are given to a man with a certain consecration; the one when he is baptized, the other when he is ordained; and therefore it is not lawful to iterate them in the Catholic Church."[2] "But if it (baptism) may be had out of the Church, why may it not also be given? If you say, It is not rightly given out of the Church, we answer, As, though it be not rightly had, yet it is had; so, though it be not rightly given out of the Church, yet it is given. But as by reconciliation to unity that begins to be had beneficially, which before was had out of unity without benefit; so by the same reconciliation to unity, that begins to be beneficial, which out of the Church was also given without benefit. It is not, however, right to say that that which was given was not given, or that any man should be wrongfully said not to have given it, when it is confessed that he gave what he had received."[1] He pursues this explanation still further in the following passage:—"As the union of bodies is by continuity of place, so the consent of wills is a sort of contact of minds. If, therefore, a man who departs from unity has a will to do anything other than that which he received in unity, in that thing he departs, and is separated;

[1] De Bapt. contra Don. lib. i. c. 1.
[2] Contra lit. Parm. lib. ii. 13.

but whatsoever he desires so to do, as it is done in unity, when he has received and learned it, in that he abides and is united. Therefore they in some things are with us, but in some things have gone out from us. Wherefore those things in which they are with us, those we do not forbid them to perform; but in those wherein they are not with us, we exhort them to come that they may have, to return that they may recover them. We do not, therefore, say to them, 'Do not administer' (*baptism*), but 'Do not administer it in schism;' nor to those who are going to be baptized, 'Do not receive' (*baptism*), but 'Do not receive it in schism.'"[1] And afterwards, in answer to the Donatist who demanded whether or no their baptism was valid to beget sons to God, intending the dilemma, if it regenerate, then *ours* must be the true Church; if not, then why do not Catholics re-baptize those whom they draw away from us? St. Augustin says:—"As if it (baptism) had the power of regeneration in that point wherein it is separated, and not in that wherein it is united. For it is separated from the bond of charity and peace, but it is joined in the oneness of Baptism. Therefore it is the one Church that alone is called Catholic; and whatsoever of its own it possesses in the communions of those divine bodies who are separated from its unity, through that which it has of its own in them, it does itself regenerate, not they. For it is not their separation

[1] De Bapt. contra Don. lib. i. 2.

which regenerates, but that which they have retained among themselves from the Church, which if they let go also, they do not regenerate at all. The Church, therefore, whose sacraments are retained, regenerates in all."[1] And the ultimate principle of their judgment he states in the following axiomatic form :—"Like as baptism, so do orders remain perfect in them; because the fault was in the separation, which, by the peace of unity, was corrected; not in the sacraments, which, wheresoever they are, are still sacraments,"[2] (quæ ubicumque sunt ipsa sunt). From this, then, it is plain that the sacraments of such Churches as have forfeited somewhat of the doctrine, but retained the discipline of Christ, have the integrity of sacraments. Their Baptism regenerates, and yet not as being theirs, but as the Baptism of the Church, which they still retain; and yet again, though it regenerate, its full effect and use is some way suspended until the regenerate man be reconciled to the Unity of the Church. But here we may take up and apply a rule we have before laid down, namely, that such as are in a state of which they are neither the conscious authors nor pertinacious maintainers, in which, too, they are either greatly hindered by any high degree of adverse moral circumstance, or absolutely holden in invincible ignorance, who also,

[1] De Bapt. cont. Don. lib. i. c. 10.

[2] Contra Ep. Parmen. lib. ii. 13. For the judgment of the Councils of Arles and Nice, see Waterland's Works, vol. x. p. 128.

in simplicity of intention and preparation of heart, seek both to know and to do the will of Christ, that all such surely belong to the soul of the One Church, and have unconscious communion with His mystical body, and direct spiritual fellowship with Himself. What is here said of Baptism will apply also to all other sacraments and sacramental rites. To such as are thus morally disposed, we may hopefully believe that, though uncanonical, they are both valid and efficacious.

It must be further observed that, whether valid or not in its mystical nature, the discipline of the Church remains among them as a moral institution bearing upon the formation of the individual character. The pastoral jurisdiction is still a repression of indocility; and the Eucharistical action the test of peace and brotherhood. The ascetic and penitential rules are still moral powers for the purification of man's nature. If we should believe such Churches reduced to the level of ethical gymnasia, it is evident that there is a high moral benefit still undoubtedly inherited. And this is a disposing cause, and ancillary to the divine life of faith. If it be not the pledge, it is the handmaid of higher realities. And if these bodies be darkened by the clouding over of truth, yet we may not err in hoping that to their pastors also, who, as it were, keep their flocks by night, there may come glad tidings and brighter lights by the secret ministries of mercy. The dogma, therefore, that in the One Church

alone there is salvation, in no way hinders our hopefully believing that many belong to the soul of the One Church who, by forfeiting a portion of their trust, have fallen from the one visible body; nor is the objective exactness of this dogma as a revealed verity infringed by such a hope.

We now come to another and more difficult form of the same question, namely, the state of those who have made forfeit of the discipline, but retained the doctrine of the Church.

I am well aware how startling at first sight must be such a contrast. Men are so thoroughly and inveterately used to speak of doctrine as the one thing needful, and of discipline as a thing unnecessary, that the very propounding of the subject may almost seem like announcing a prejudged conclusion.

I must, therefore, once more fall back upon a position taken up in the first part of this work. In entering upon the subject, I adopted the familiar distinction of the great mystery of Christ into doctrine and discipline, under an express protest. I stated that, although sufficiently clear to work with, it was a distinction essentially unexact. The use of it has hitherto admitted no fallacious ambiguity, because the whole current of our reasoning has been directed against the popular errors which lurk under its shelter. It is a common axiom that discipline may be changed, but doctrine never; and this is true, so long as by discipline is understood

only the detailed orders and rules of administration which the apostolical authority may develop out of itself, such as the penitential code, and the like. But when taken to include what are commonly, but most unmeaningly, called forms of Church government, it is absolutely untrue. Throughout this work I have endeavoured to prove that the organic polity of the Church is a divine institution, positive, indeed, in its nature, but moral in its design; that it is not subject to man, but man to it; that he may not re-cast it, forasmuch as it is ordained to re-mould his very being; that it is, therefore, absolutely and universally binding, and immutable. There is no reason which will clear a man for rejecting the apostolical succession, which will not also acquit him for rejecting baptism; there is no reason to establish the right of men, without succession from the Apostles, to administer the Holy Eucharist, which will not justify the taking away of the cup. The positive institutions of Christ, being moral as a continuous probation, and mystical in their complex effect, are binding in all their parts. To touch them in one point is to mutilate them in all. It is a usurpation of the will of man upon the will of Christ, and a subjecting of the mould to the nature which it is ordained to shape. So much as to the positive and moral nature of discipline.

But we must look also to its mystical design. Once more it must be asked, Are the Sacraments of

Christ to be called doctrine, or discipline? If doctrine, why shall we not call Confirmation and the Apostolical Succession also doctrine? Why shall we not call the Church itself doctrine? Did Christ institute Baptism and the Lord's Supper? Did He not also institute the Church? Who was it that said, "As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you?" What is the doctrine of Christ but the relation of what He did and suffered for us, presented to our understanding? Now, I ask, did He, or did He not, ordain a means of applying to mankind, and to each man severally, the benefit of His blood-shedding? If He did so, what is that means? There is no alternative but to assert either that He did, or that He did not ordain, such a means; and that the means ordained is either by presenting truth to the human understanding only, or by some further mode of making man a partaker in what he so understands. Is the mere process of understanding alone a sufficient application of the blood of Christ to the soul of man? Or does each man, by an act of his own will, apply it to himself? Is it man's work or God's work? Now these questions must be answered by those that would retain the popular theory of doctrine and discipline as things separate and heterogeneous. They that believe that it is God who applies the benefits of His Son's death to the souls of men, (and I know not how any Christian can dispute it,) believe also that He has ordained a certain and definite means for applying it. They

believe also that the means of applying it is as absolutely necessary, though in another category, as the thing applied; and they believe the discipline of the Church, which includes the Holy Sacraments and the Divine authority to apply them, to be that means. They cannot, therefore, separate doctrine from discipline any more than truth and grace from the means through which this twofold blessing is declared and delivered to them. They are as the structure of the eye to the light of heaven, diverse in nature, but absolutely conjoined by a Divine order as the condition of sight; or, once more, the whole Church, including doctrine and discipline, is to them the manifold means through which the presence of Christ impresses itself upon the whole nature of man. It is so commingled as to reach his understanding, will, affections, imagination, sight, and sense. The whole man is a partaker of the Church as also of the redemption which by the Church is applied to him. It is the more reverent way thus to look upon the institutions of Christ; to believe that they are the garments of His own unseen presence; that they are one sacred indivisible whole, to be reverently approached with feet unshod as upon holy ground; to be gazed on with penetrating contemplation; to be handled even as when Thomas, with a better instructed faith, drew near to behold his Lord. They that so boldly divide these things may be indefinitely near the temper of those of whom it is written,

"They parted my garments among them, and upon my vesture did they cast lots."

We may now return to the question before us, *i. e.* the case of those who have forfeited the discipline, retaining the doctrine of the Church.

The instances are such communities of Christians as, from various causes becoming separated from the local jurisdiction of the Church, established Presbyterian, or other still more imperfect, forms of Church government. They may be described generally under the heads of Lutherans, Zuinglians, and Calvinists; in which designations may be included the bodies which separated themselves from the obedience of the British Churches.

I will not at present raise the question whether or no these bodies have indeed retained the integrity of doctrine. We will assume it, and deal with the case as if it were proved.

It is not my intention to enter at large into the causes or the mode of the original separation. The question before us is far more extensive, and might be treated as a mere hypothesis. Still I am bound to say that, on the one hand, the just causes of complaint, which made Luther first address the bishops of Brandenburg and Mersberg, and his steady appeals through every gradation of ecclesiastical order to the award of a general council; and on the other, the violent and corrupt administration of Leo X., ending in an excommunication against a man whose cause was still unheard, seem effectually

to clear both him and those who for his sake were driven from the unity of the Church from the guilt of schism. Be this, however, as it may, it is not to be denied that the Protestant bodies, partly through the sustained hostility of their adversaries, and partly through their own fault, soon began to justify as true and right a condition which they ought to have lamented as the pressure of a hard necessity. They formed, and pleaded for, and perpetuated their imperfect system, as if of Divine authority; and by these after-acts cancelled not a little of the early justness of their cause. There can be no doubt that many who were involved in the effects of the excommunication, though violently driven from the unity of the visible Church, were not cut off from the unity of Christ's mystical body. It is an undeniable rule that an excommunication, *clave errante*, though effectual as to its visible results, is as to all invisible effects absolutely null. This was doubtless true of many in the beginning of the separation; but at the same time the Protestant bodies did not, like the Nestorian Churches, fall off as integral members of the Church universal, but were formed by the personal separation of individual men. It can hardly be thought that so large a proportion were unconsciously involved. Their societies were compacted together by the conscious self-addiction of responsible persons. And yet it may be pleaded in mitigation that their cause was just and righteous, and the behaviour of their adversaries was harsh

and prejudiced. With this we may leave the subject of their first separation.

It does not yet appear how it can be proved that these communities have retained the succession derived from the Apostles, and, with this, the authority of Christ to minister sacraments in His name. They constituted a ministry of their own, and continued the use of Baptism and the Supper of the Lord. What are we to judge of sacraments as used among them? It will be remembered that the reasoning under the last section, relating to the validity of baptism administered by heretics and schismatics, in all cases applied only to the baptisms of ordained men. Nothing hitherto said expressly relates to the baptism of unordained hands. The principles on which St. Augustin argued for the validity of such sacraments are these: first, that they were administered by men possessing holy orders; and, secondly, that, when administered, both baptism and orders impress an indelible character. But there is yet another question to be considered, namely, whether or no the Church acknowledged the baptisms of those who had never received the "*jus dandi*," or authority to administer the sacrament. The principle of the Church was as follows: The authority to baptize was given to the Apostles, to be conveyed to those whom they should see fit to invest with it. They invested the bishops of the Church with the same power of administering and of transmitting the power. The bishops of the

Church at first so far restrained it to themselves as to suffer no presbyter to baptize without their consent. When the baptism of presbyters had become common, still it was withheld from deacons: to them, however, in the absence of the bishop and priest, or in cases of necessity, the privilege was conceded. In cases of necessity, and in the absence of bishop, priest, and deacon, a Catholic layman, authorized by the bishop, might give baptism. So far, and no further, the privilege of baptizing was extended within the unity of the Church. The baptism of a deacon without license was uncanonical; of a layman without license was a usurpation likened to the sin of Uzziah: yet the baptism, being given, was not iterated, because of its indelible character. We must now go on to the cases of baptism given out of the unity of the Church, and without authority. They are of two kinds: first, baptisms administered by ordained men in heresy or schism; next, baptisms given by men unordained, unlicensed, and without the Church. This is the only form of the case with which we are now concerned. We shall, however, better understand the mind of the Church upon the point, if we take up the subject where we left it in the last section, and carry it on until we come to the question before us.

We have already seen that, in virtue of the indelible character of orders, the validity of baptism was allowed in the case of heretical and schismatical

clergy. We will now consider how far the Church has permitted the intervention of laymen.

In the Apostolical Constitutions, which may be taken to represent the sense of the Church in the first ages, laymen are expressly forbidden to baptize.[1] By Tertullian it is said that laymen have an inherent right to baptize in virtue of their own baptism, but a suspended right in virtue of the institution of the priesthood :[2] which argument, while it contends for the abstract validity of the act, denies the ordinary lawfulness. The Council of Eliberis gave permission to laymen, having their own baptism perfect (which may mean either being in full communion with the Church, or in opposition to clinic baptism), and not being bigamists (being thereby also susceptible of holy orders), to administer baptism in foreign travel, or when no Church is near, to a catechumen in necessity of sickness ; and yet so that, in the case of life being prolonged, they should bring the baptized person to the bishop for imposition of hands.[3] In this permissive canon there are no less than *seven* distinct limitations ; two in point of place, two in the administration, two in the subject, and one in case of survival.

[1] Const. Apost. lib. iii. c. 10.

[2] "Dandi quidem habet jus summus sacerdos qui est episcopus : dehinc Presbyteri et Diaconi ; non tamen sine Episcopi auctoritate, propter Ecclesiæ honorem, quo salvo, salva pax est. Alioquin etiam laïcis jus est." De Baptismo, xvii.

[3] Albaspin de Veter. Eccles. Ritibus. Not. in Can. 38. Concil. Elib., p. 318.

No better proof can be given of the sense of the Spanish Church, at least. In a passage ascribed to St. Augustin, the same doctrine is held, namely, that by delegation through the bishop a layman may baptize. He gives also an instance, such as the Council had in view, namely, of baptism administered by a layman on board a ship in a storm; and concludes that it may be done in extreme necessity.[1] In like manner he says, arguing for the validity of schismatical baptisms, "Although even a layman, compelled by necessity, should give to a dying man that which, when he himself received it, he learned how it is to be given, I know not how any one will piously say it should be repeated. If it be done, indeed, with no compelling necessity, it is an usurpation of another's office; but if necessity compel, it is either no fault, or a venial one."[2] St. Jerome also, speaking of the necessity of the sacerdotal order as a means of unity, adds, "Hence it came that, without the chrism and order of the bishop, neither presbyter nor deacon have a right to baptize; which often, if necessity compel, we know to be permitted to laymen."[3] It is plain that both St. Augustin and St. Jerome speak of Catholic laymen; and the latter of a permitted license, otherwise deeming it a usurpation. A parallel expression may be found in the Epistle of Gelasius. Indeed, without more reference, it may

[1] Ap. Gratian de consecrat. Dict. 4, 36, quoted by Bingham, Scholastical Hist. c. i. 13.

[2] Contra Ep. Parm. lib. ii. 13.

[3] Adv. Luciferianos, tom. iv. 295, ed. Ben.

be stated that it was a prevalent rule to acknowledge baptisms administered by laymen, with license, in cases of necessity, and in the unity of the Church. There is one more step to be considered, namely, how the Church was wont to regard the baptism of a layman given without license or necessity. St. Augustin puts this case as an hypothesis, and says, "What has been given cannot be said to have been not given;" and, on the principle of the indelible character of baptism, adds that it is not to be iterated: but he declares it to be usurped, unlawful, and, unless repented of, pernicious to the giver and receiver.[1] He then goes on to say, that there is another question concerning baptism administered by men who are not themselves Christians, of which, without the authority of a council, he says he will not venture an assertion; and then adds: "But concerning those that are separated from the unity of the Church, there is now no question but that they both have and may give baptism, and that they have and give it to their own destruction, out of the bond of peace. For this has been already discussed, considered, defined, and confirmed, in the unity of the whole world."[2] This mention of an œcumenical synod must refer to the Council either of Arles or of Nice; and by this we may fix the line and the limits of St. Augustin's argument: for both judged by the same rule. By the Council of Nice it is ordered that the Novatian clergy should be received in their orders, and therefore, of course, with their baptisms. And

[1] Contra Ep. Parmen. lib. ii. 13. [2] Ibid.

this was all St. Augustin was labouring to establish against the Donatists. His hypothesis of usurped lay baptism, given out of the Church, was confirmed by no council, but only the schismatical baptisms of men having valid orders; and the argument was as follows:—If we acknowledge among ourselves the usurped baptisms of laymen, how much more the unlawful baptisms of ordained men among you. Thus far, from antiquity, there is no warrant to believe that usurped baptism by unordained men in schism was acknowledged to be valid. I say as yet, because we will next consider an hypothetical case put by St. Augustin, and his own resolution of it. He proposes the following series of questions:—Ought the baptism of a man not himself baptized to be acknowledged? Does the state of mind in the receiver affect the integrity of the sacrament; as, for instance, when it is received in simulation, or without simulation? If in simulation, whether deceitfully, as in the Church, or in that which is thought to be the Church; or in sport, as in a theatre? And which is the more sinful, to receive baptism deceitfully in the Church, or without deceit in heresy or schism; that is, without simulation of mind? or again, in heresy with deceit, or in a theatre with faith, if so be any one in the act should be moved with sudden piety? After many hypothetical comparisons or contrasts of this sort, he goes on to say: "But it is safe for us not to venture forward with rashness of judgment into those things

which have neither been begun in any Catholic provincial council, nor determined in any plenary council; but to assert that only with confidence which, under the government of our Lord God and Saviour Jesus Christ, has been confirmed by the consent of the Universal Church. However, if any one should urge me to say what I should judge if I were present at any council in which a question on these points should be raised, and none had spoken before me whose opinions I should rather follow—if I were then so affected as I was when I spoke as I have done, I should by no means doubt that they had received baptism who, wheresoever, and by whomsoever, had received that rite consecrated by the evangelical word, without simulation on their own part, and with a certain faith: although it would not avail for their spiritual salvation, if they lacked charity by which they should be engrafted into the Catholic Church. For 'though I have faith to move mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing.' As also, passing by the determinations of our forefathers (the Council of Carthage), I doubt not that they have baptism who, though they receive it deceitfully, yet receive it in the Church, or wheresoever the Church is thought to be by those in whose society it is received, concerning whom it is said, 'They went out from us.'"[1] He then adds, that the other questions concerning simulation and mockery God only can determine. I think it may

[1] De Bapt. cont. Don. lib. vii. 53.

be said that we have now the full evidence which may be drawn from the first four centuries in favour of the validity of baptisms administered uncanonically, and in usurpation of office. It amounts to this:—

1. That lay baptisms by licence, and in the unity of the Church, are to be recognized.

2. That lay baptisms without licence or necessity, but in the unity of the Church, are censured, but admitted.

3. That baptisms by ordained men in heresy or schism are valid, but unlawful.

4. That baptisms by unordained men out of the unity of the Church are usurpations, and yet not to be iterated, for this reason, that the Sacrament has still an integrity in itself.

But it is to be observed that this last conclusion is no determination of the Church, but only an opinion given by St. Augustin under protest and with submission. It was, therefore, a point undefined.

We may now adduce the counter-evidence:—

1. Every Christian writer for three hundred years, with the only exception of Tertullian, and that in one passage alone, asserts the absolute unlawfulness of a layman's assuming any sacerdotal office, which the Apostolical Constitutions, the entire testimony of St. Cyprian, the arguments of St. Basil and Pacian and others, plainly show.

2. The whole scheme of first principles on which the Church was founded confirms the same rule;

as, for instance, the divine and proper nature of the priesthood as distinguished from the spiritual and virtual priesthood of all Christians. Writers but slightly acquainted with the testimonies of antiquity have almost always fallen into a confusion on this point. They have taken up the one passage in Tertullian, and the other in St. Jerome, in which they both quote the words of the Apocalypse, "who hath made us kings and priests unto God," as showing that all Christians are priests. But the passage would prove equally well that all Christians are kings; and so it does, but not in the sense required by the parties adducing it. Granted that all Christians, spiritually and virtually, are kings and priests. In that, then, the clergy and laity are equal. A bishop, or a priest, or a deacon, is a king and a priest by inherent right as much as a layman; but they have something further which that layman never had, and never can have, except as they themselves received it; and that is, a divine commission and authority to stand in Christ's stead between God and man. This no man has, nor can have, by baptism alone; and no man, how hardily soever he may have asserted it, has ever ventured the attempt to prove it by evidence from Christian records, or even to meet the refutative evidence by which the error is overthrown. It were as good, because God called the people of Israel "a kingdom of priests," [1] to deny the divine appointment of the

[1] Exodus xix. 6.

Aaronic priesthood. A further and a final proof of this may be found in the fact that, throughout the whole mass of all that constitutes the history, records, laws, documents, of Christianity, there is not one that does not declare ordination and the consecration of the Eucharist by a layman to be absolutely null. By the same rule all sacerdotal functions were alike vested in the priesthood alone.

Upon all these grounds, therefore, upon the Divine commission restricting sacerdotal functions to the priesthood of Christ, upon the limitations imposed even on priests and deacons in the ministering of Baptism, upon the complex and manifold limitations under which, in extreme necessity alone, a lay hand was licensed to baptize; upon the strong determination of the African and Eastern churches annulling all baptisms even of ordained men out of the unity of the Church, which determinations, though reversed, show plainly enough the current of belief; upon the bare and hypothetical reasoning by which St. Augustin ultimately decides that no baptism administered with all things necessary to its integral perfection should be iterated; upon the fact that the early Church made no determination on the validity of baptism by laymen in a state of schism, because no such case was ever propounded for decision: upon all these grounds we may safely conclude that such baptisms are thus far doubtful.

As a contrary determination has for some cen-

turies prevailed in the Roman Church, it may be right to notice it in this place. By Pope Nicholas it was determined, and afterwards declared by the Council of Florence, that in case of necessity it is lawful for any man or woman, whether Christian or Pagan, to baptize, if only there be present the right form, matter, and intention.[1] The reason assigned by Bellarmine is this: "Since there is not required, in the minister of baptism, faith, probity, or orders, there is no reason why the baptism which is ministered by a Pagan or a Jew should not be true baptism, if those things be present which are necessary to the essence of baptism."[2] He afterwards observes, that the rule given by Tertullian and Jerome, that a man may give what he has received, is untrue, for so a Presbyter might ordain a Presbyter, and a deacon a deacon. He then adds, that it is not a good argument to say that a man cannot give what he has not himself received; for so, unworthy ministers could not convey justification to others: and he sums up as follows:—"Therefore it is not required that he who is to minister baptism should have baptism formally in himself; but it is enough if he have it virtually and ministerially, as all have who have the use of reason, speech, and hands, so as to speak by design, and sprinkle water."[3]

Now upon this determination there are many things to be observed: as, first, that the primitive Church did for ages most strictly inhibit baptism

[1] Bellarm. de Sacr. Bapt. c. vii. 7. [2] Ib. [3] Ib. s. 8.

to all women;[1] that there is no evidence that the baptism of women was received when usurped;[2] that the practice of indiscriminate baptism crept in through a misapplication of one text of St. John,[3] as the practice of infant communion was declared necessary to salvation from the seventh century onward through a misapplication of another;[4] that it is abhorrent from the instincts of Christianity to conceive that a Pagan may, uncalled and unconverted, minister a Sacrament of Christ.

It is to be further observed that Bellarmine speaks too freely when he says that a General Council, as St. Augustin desired, has determined the doubt which he did not venture to resolve: for it is well known that the Council of Florence was not general either by representation or reception; that it was a synod got up against the Council of Basle; that it was attended by only a few bishops, who left the Council of Basle, and by the Pope's court and followers; that the French Church and kingdom did not then acknowledge it, nor do the Gallican[5] or Eastern Churches acknowledge it now.

Neither was the Council of Trent, in which this decision is virtually renewed, a General Council.

Therefore the question is as open now as in St. Augustin's day. It seems evident, then, that if the baptisms of unordained men out of the unity

[1] Bingham's Scholastical History of Lay Baptism, ch. i. s. 17.
[2] Ib. s. 18. [3] St. John iii. 5. [4] Ib. vi. 53.
[5] Launoii Epist. lib. viii. c. 39.

of the Church cannot be shown to be invalid, neither can they be shown with certain reason to be valid; and, therefore, although the Sacrament may not be iterated, it may, as in a case of doubt, be conditionally given to such as are reconciled to the unity of the Church.

But it must be further observed, that in the texture of the evidence, which seems to favour the validity or actuality, if I may so speak, of all baptisms administered with the right form, matter, and intention, are interwoven also frequent assertions of the suspended efficacy, or even of the perilous effect of baptisms which are given, received, and had out of the unity of the Church. Repentance and reconciliation are declared to be necessary to give to such baptisms their saving power.[1]

We are now in a condition to go on with the inquiry as to the rites and sacraments of the communities which have forfeited the discipline of the Church.

It seems that in these bodies the authority transmitted by succession from the Apostles is lost, and with it the primary idea of all acts done by commission from Christ. That in cases of absolute necessity a community should confine ministerial functions to one or more, without pretending to invest them with sacerdotal powers which it does not, either taken severally or as a body, possess, would be, I conceive, not only a lawful but commendable act, as testify-

[1] S. Aug. ut supra, pp. 320, 321.

ing to their own incompetence to renew what Christ alone began, their desire of its restoration, their deliberate endeavour to follow the Divine analogy, and to come as near as possible to the form of the Divine institution. We may readily believe that such a conduct would have the silent power of a commendatory prayer interceding with God for deliverance from their straits, and a restitution of His own gifts. We need hardly, therefore, enter upon a formal justification of the provisional steps taken by Luther and others at the beginning of their great movement. If they had seen no way of regaining the shelter of the Apostolical Succession, there was still a safe, though a sad, resource for them. They might have well commended themselves to God's mercy, as those who are smitten by unjust excommunications. But, in fact, their ultimate difficulties were not so great as some would make them appear. It is easier to show that they were pressed by a necessity at the outset than in the after-course of their proceedings. It cannot be doubted that they might have obtained valid consecrations;[1] but they deliberately rejected the apostolical discipline, and constituted a new ministry, to which it appears that they re-ordained priests and even bishops who had received Catholic ordination. From this point in their course they must find their

[1] Jer. Taylor, Episcopacy asserted, p. 106; and Skinner's Eccl. Hist. of Scotland, vol. ii. pp. 129—137, where ten Bishops holding the reformed doctrines are named.

own defence. In what sense they possess the present authority of Christ among them, by what commission they administer baptism, confirmation, absolution, orders, the Holy Eucharist, in Christ's stead and name, we know not. What decision soever we may make in favour of a baptism so received, it is certain that the Catholic Church has never for a moment admitted the validity of confirmation, absolution, orders, or the Eucharist by the hands of unordained men. Granting that their baptisms are to be received, what shall be said of the whole line of Christian ordinances by which the path of redeemed man is marked out to heaven, and the generations of the Church by a spiritual lineage perpetuated and bound in one?

And this case becomes the stronger when we turn our thoughts from the Lutheran and Calvinist bodies abroad to schismatics from the British churches. In behalf of the foreign communities it may be pleaded that they were excluded by unjust excommunications, and that their exclusion was perpetuated by an iron necessity galling their conscience to the very quick. Not so they that separated from the British churches: they were not excommunicated, but self-severed from the Catholic Church: they did not withdraw from churches tainted with Roman errors, but from bishops witnessing the pure word of God: they had neither necessity nor justifying plea for their separation. It was a deliberate schism, beginning not in a

secession which, as a landslip, carries with it involuntary and unconscious sufferers, but in a personal, several, conscious choice and election. The individual will was energetically active, and almost every several man responsible for his acts. Now of such self-aggregated bodies all that we can safely assert is, that the baptisms they administer should not be more than conditionally supplied. For so long as they persist in schism and rivalry, and in seeking the overthrow of the branches of the Catholic Church in Great Britain, they must strip themselves of every plea of necessity or of ignorance. Such seems to be the conclusion inevitable to all who prefer rather to be guided by Catholic rule than by the wayward, self-trusting calculations of a private spirit. And it must be confessed that this reduces the mystical character of the Sacraments and other rites used by these communities to a difficult question, of which I shall attempt no decision.

We may now go on to consider the moral character and effect of these self-constituted systems. If there be any truth in what has been already urged, the discipline of the Church is an effectual probation, and means of moulding the character of men, in virtue of their one chief condition, namely, that it is not of man, but of God. It is as the relations of fatherhood and brotherhood which nature ordains, unchangeable and sacred, compared with voluntary associations, of which every member comes in or goes out as likes him best. In the former there is

settled authority, and binding ligatures, and peremptory laws of obedience and forbearance. In the latter there is no authority but such as men have made for themselves, no brotherhood but such as they have chosen. So soon as the yoke galls, or the curb checks, the individual will withdraws itself. It escapes from the probation so soon as the discipline makes its first approaches felt. It is obvious that, wheresoever the will of man is free to withdraw from its guide and ruler, it guides and rules itself. In those communities, therefore, which have made forfeit of this moral government, we should expect to find what in fact we do see,—the traditionary types of character clouded and lowered; the judgments of men moulding and debasing the revealed rule; the corrective powers weakened; the individual will overgrown to a principle of moral anarchy; the intellect excited into a craving activity, impatient of external evidence, veering and changing about in the currents of individual bias and prejudice. Perhaps the leading phenomenon of such communities will be found to be the overwrought energy of the intellect, laborious in destruction, and too restless ever to build up any positive truth. The very nature of man, losing its unity with God in the unity of His Church, is at jar and bickering with itself; and its direct tendency is to baffle its own powers, and to reduce itself to nothing.

And, lastly, we may take up what was before only thrown out in passing. As a result of this

moral decline, we find also in all such bodies as have forfeited the discipline of the Church, that they have lost also even that which they seemed to retain. "Whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken away even that he hath."[1] We find in every case that they have forfeited, more or less, the doctrine also. It is not to be thought that there are nowhere to be found men who retain the doctrines of Christian redemption; but that, as a whole, the bodies which have lost the discipline of Christ have sunk into rationalism, Socinianism, and infidelity. It would be easy to specify other errors destructive of sanctity, but these are the broader and more theological features of their declension, and to them I would confine myself. In very deed, unity is the sacrament of truth. It is by unity that it is conserved and transmitted; by abruption and isolation that it is exhausted and extinguished. The state of doctrinal teaching in these bodies in Germany, Poland, Switzerland, many parts of France, Great Britain, and America, will shew that the unity of doctrine, the one faith once delivered to the saints, is not among them. Many of them have ceased to witness for Christ's Godhead, manhood, and sacrifice; that is, for the faith in which "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned."

Now it is plain that, by their original forfeiture of the one discipline, they virtually and initially

[1] St. Matthew xiii. 12.

forfeited the whole deposit of Christ. The first loss drew all others after it. Although the full declension was not seen at once, the mystical, moral, and doctrinal systems perished together. They lingered on as bodies of which the organic frame is maimed; and they died rather by a natural than by a mysterious law. Even after their virtual extinction as Christian Churches, there was, as in the corpse of the dead, a lingering warmth, which made a mocking promise of life; till that too fled, and they were left in the cold torpor of heresy or unbelief.

What may be the change in the condition of such bodies, consequent upon the breach of their relation of faith with God, is a mystery which must be left to His inscrutable mercy. What must be the condition of all men who make forfeit of the moral *media*, so to speak, of salvation, it is easier to judge. It is evident that the loss of truth and discipline must put the moral nature of man at a disadvantage indefinitely great. If the restoration of the right knowledge of God in the face of Jesus Christ be a means to restore the Divine image to the soul of man, if the Church be so formed by the wisdom of God as to teach and to train the moral nature of man into His own likeness, it is evident that the rejection of it must involve a loss by natural consequence, so far as those means are contemplated, of the designed results. And if it be also a probation of man's faith, then failure in the trial must have some consequence in the world unseen.

Nevertheless, the fruits of the Spirit of God, though often cunningly simulated by unsanctified men, have a stamp and character which in the main are surely to be known; so that God may be seen oftentimes revealing His merciful purpose in the manifest righteousness of men whose outward lot is most adverse to a Christian's hope. Wheresoever these are seen, they are to be acknowledged with thankfulness. Though in many circumstantial conditions unlike Cornelius, yet their acceptance may be assured to us by his. The analogy of God's revealed design in the Gospel may persuade us of a truth, which the actual precedents of His dispensations may not be enough to prove, namely, that as, in the elder economy, He admitted many approximations to salvation in those who were not true partakers of its visible sacraments, so now among all mankind, whether in nations never as yet converted, or in bodies which have been disinherited by the act of their forefathers, we may confidently trust that many belong to the soul of the one true Church who have never been made partakers of its visible body. And here I must note, once for all, a deep and injurious fallacy, which is often imposed upon high and Christian minds. The doctrine of Catholic unity, as stated in this work, is represented to them as highly uncharitable, and at variance with the love of God, because it is assumed that all communities which have forfeited their inheritance in the one body have thereby forfeited the character of a Church,

and that all believers in Christ in these communities have forfeited their hope of salvation. It is therefore assumed to be the more charitable conclusion, that the one Church is of a latitude to comprehend them also in its visible pale. Some would have it to consist of all Christian people; but this is only shifting the difficulty of the question: some, of all who believe the essentials of the Gospel; but no two men can agree in stating what these essentials are: some, of all who live a holy life; but this denies even the visibleness of the Church: and some, again, of all who believe the ultimate facts of the Gospel; but this would hold in its embrace those that deny the Godhead of our Redeemer. All these mutually exclusive and self-destructive theories are so many attempts to bring the outlying phenomena of God's continuous providential and unrevealed government under the positive institution of His revealed will. As if we must know all His ways; as if God's wisdom were either not manifold, or were revealed to the last idea. And this is often done out of a mistaken feeling of charity; and, as such, it deserves no sharper check than that which Peter received, when feelings of care and charity for a brother apostle led him to press forward beyond the line of Christ's declared mind, "What is that to thee? Follow thou me."[1] But we will pass from the temper which predisposes men towards this charitable hope, to the paralogism by which they impose upon their

[1] St. John xxi. 20—22.

judgment. They believe it, because they hope it. But it must be remembered that hope and belief are not relative things. Hope and fear, belief and disbelief, are the real antagonists. We believe or disbelieve according to the evidence for any fact; we hope or fear according to the character and consequences of the fact either proved, or probable upon the evidence proposed. Our hope may not, any more than our fear, overrule our belief. Either way we are merely deceiving ourselves; the feeling of our nature is usurping a tyranny over our reason and conscience. In fact, they who disbelieve the eternity of punishment because they fear it, and they who believe the indefinite theory of Catholic unity because they hope it to be true, must be classed in the same category, though the moral affections be diametrically opposed. In both cases, evidence is made to yield to the wishes, and the reason to the will.

Again, it must be remembered that the endeavours of modern times to construct a theory which shall embrace all the anomalies of Christendom are most narrow and partial. It is argued that the condition of so large a body of Christians, perhaps thirty or forty millions in number, who have forfeited the Apostolical succession, claims at our hands some concession. Whether we are appointed of God to make such concessions from His institutions, whether this giving of largess of that which is another's may not bring us under the condemnation of the

steward who wasted his master's goods, is a matter to be considered by all serious men. But waiving this point, it seems always forgotten that all Christendom for fifteen hundred years, and more than five-sixths of Christendom from the Apostles to this day, have ever stayed their belief on the promises of Christ made to His one Catholic Church. They that are concerned to establish a looser theory, how numerous soever when taken by themselves, are a small fraction of the Christendom of to-day, and as a handful compared with the multitudes of Christians who from the beginning have lived, hoped, suffered, and died in another trust.

But, lastly, I have endeavoured to show that the supposed consequences of this Catholic doctrine do not in fact flow from it. It is one thing to assert that there is no proof that God has revealed another way of salvation besides the one Church, and another thing to say that all concerning whom God has revealed nothing shall certainly be lost. This no man dare say; nor does it follow from the principle here affirmed. The shallowest logician can tell us that between the propositions, "All that live faithfully in the one Church shall be saved," and "None that are out of the one Church shall be saved," there is neither by conversion nor by inference any imaginable connexion.

But, once more, let it be observed that we have ascertained a plain and sufficient principle, by which we may well and surely believe in the salvation of

all those who bring forth the fruits of repentance and faith, and of no others, whether they be heirs of the one Church, or disinherited of their birthright, or never so much as included within the precincts of Christendom. In all such the one inscrutable Spirit dwells, and they are one in an unconscious and invisible unity; while the conscious and visible unity of the Church Catholic stands unshaken. This will remain a fact, a phenomenon, a mystery, a sacrament, a witness of manifold wisdom revealed and unrevealed, to the world's end. At the same time we have seen reason to believe that they who forfeit the unity of the Church place themselves, or are placed by others, at a grave disadvantage—it may be in a great peril; and this by the forfeiture of the mystical, moral, and doctrinal media, and helps, to holiness and everlasting life. And this great law the analogy of all God's dealings, natural and revealed, confirms; as, for instance, disease following sin, inherited poverty, and the like: and, again, the removing of the candlestick for the fathers' sins, the state of the Asiatic and African Churches, the folds of Cyril and Clement, of Cyprian and Augustin, at this day.

CHAPTER III.

THE LOSS OF SUBJECTIVE UNITY.

It now remains for us to consider the last form of the subject before us, namely, the condition of those Christian churches which, retaining the objective unity of doctrine and discipline, have forfeited the subjective unity of inter-communion.

I have already shown that this subjective unity is one proximate final end for which the objective unity is ordained; and that it is the matter of probation, duty, and responsibility to the individual Christian, and to the several churches of the Catholic communion.

The first instance we may take is that of the Donatist schism. It is true that this case does not fall with absolute strictness under the enunciation of our present question; and yet it is for the most part included in it, and it has no approximation to any other division of the subject. The Donatist schism is an example of the forfeiture of subjective

unity in a particular Church by the establishment of a rival succession of bishops. Only one of these could be the lawful succession, though both were undoubtedly valid. It is unnecessary to go further into the history than to state that, on the vacancy of the see of Carthage, a division was made in the choice and consecration of a successor. Cæcilianus being lawfully elected and consecrated, the antagonist party objected that one of his consecrators, Felix of Aptungus, had been a traditor in the Dioclesian persecution. This, with other accusations against Cæcilianus, formed their pretext for electing and consecrating Majorinus. There were thenceforward two successions in the African Churches, and afterwards in Gaul and Rome also. In Africa the Donatist body for a time were the majority, and their bishops out-numbered the Catholic. The rival succession maintained itself for more than a hundred years. The characteristic temper of the two bodies is remarkable. The Donatists denounced the Catholics as idolatrous and defiled, re-ordained and re-baptized all converts, assumed exclusively to themselves the title of Catholic, and taught that the whole Catholic Church, except themselves, was fallen from Christ. It is not to our present purpose to go into the detail of their pride, covetousness, violence, and rebellion. I am speaking of them only as a phenomenon in relation to the objective Unity of the Church. On the other hand, the Catholics acknowledged them as Christians, called

them brethren,[1] recognized the orthodoxy of their faith and the validity of their Sacraments. They denied only that they belonged to the one Church, and that because they had broken the bond of unity by erecting a rival succession and a rival altar in churches of apostolical foundation. Their act of internal schism cut them off from the unity of their own churches, and thereby from the Church universal. It must be always borne in mind that their schism began by withdrawing from the communion of their lawful bishops. It was a schism in a Diocese, and a rivalry of successions in a Diocesan Church. To this we may apply most of our conclusions respecting those who have forfeited the objective Unity of the Church. It is true that the Donatists possessed a valid succession and valid Sacraments. Even though their schism was most stubborn and turbulent, yet still the Catholics acknowledged in them all that was of God, all that belonged to the Church, all that they had carried with them out of the unity of the one body of Christ. They declared that their acts were valid, though the efficacy was suspended. The saving power, they taught, was in the one Church, to which by reconciliation, with imposition of hands, they might still be joined, so as to make the Sacraments received in schism avail to the salvation of their souls. To the Donatist clergy they offered

[1] S. Aug. de Baptismo, lib. i. xv. See also Letter of Bishop Bedell to Mr. Waddesworth, Life, p. 284.

a recognition of their orders, and to their bishops the next succession after the death of the present Catholic possessor of the see. To these principles the Catholic Church still adhered, even after the repeated decisions of councils and appeals had condemned the Donatists as formal and pertinacious schismatics, and after the bloody and anti-christian acts of their adherents had confirmed the justice of the sentence in the face of Christendom.

The next form of the question is that of forfeited unity, or suspended communion between two or more apostolical Churches. It is to be observed that, as the last was internal, so this is external separation. Of this there may be two kinds; as, for instance, when the Churches so at variance are either still in communion with some third portion of the Church universal, or not.

Of the former kind was the breach between Victor and the Roman Church on one side, and Polycrates and the Asiatic Churches on the other, on the subject of the quarto-deciman rule; and also, at a later time, between Stephen and St. Cyprian on the subject of re-baptizing; and between the Roman and African Churches on the subject of appeals. In the latter case St. Augustin, Eugenius, Fulgentius, were all involved in upholding the apostolical commission of the African Churches, and in all probability departed this life while as yet the breach was unhealed.[1] In these cases both parties

[1] Laud's Conference with Fisher, pp. 113, 114. Ed. 1686.

were still in communion with other and the same churches.

Of the latter kind is, first, the division of the Eastern and Western Churches. Although for some time they still continued partially to communicate with other churches, yet at the last they were completely divided. The Christian world was sundered; and the two great members had no third or common body to unite them. They were in point of extent so nearly equal that each claimed to be the greater;[1] and no one can venture to award between them. They mutually charged each the other with heresy and schism; and history abundantly proves that they were both in fault—the Greeks by violence, the Latins by ambition: the Greeks denouncing the addition of the words "Filioque" as heretical, which they are not; the Latins requiring the acceptance of them as if they had the sanction of a General Council, which they do not possess: but be the faults of the Greek Churches never so great, they cannot be laid in the balance against the usurpation of a supreme pontificate by the Bishop of Rome. This attempt of the Roman Patriarch to subject the four Eastern Patriarchates to his exaggerated jurisdiction is a claim which, so long as persisted in, must throw upon the Roman Church the sin of keeping open an inveterate schism. The most learned and candid writers of that communion have

[1] Nectarius adv. Imp. Papæ, 253. Palmer's Treatise on the Church, vol. i. p. 203.

long ago acknowledged that the conduct of the Roman Church in thrusting bishops and clergy into the Eastern Churches was unjustifiable on any principle but that of providing Latin rites for members of the Latin Church dwelling or detained in the East; and that the vain theory on which it is persevered in is one chief cause of irreconcileable alienation.[1] For seven or eight hundred years this separation has been complete; and for four hundred all systematic efforts at reconciliation may be said to have ceased.[2] Now no man can diligently examine and sum up the charges on either side without being thoroughly satisfied that, if a more petulant temper be found among the Greeks, yet the formal and positive causes of division are to be laid to the charge of the Roman Church. One instance will suffice, namely, in the extravagant and intolerable claim of universal supremacy.

Upon these grounds, it may be safely concluded that on neither side is there either formal heresy or schism of such a kind as to cut either of them off from the one visible Church, and from communion with the one Head of the Church in heaven. Although on both sides a most grievous wrong and wound is done to the body of Christ, yet on both sides there may be salvation. Both, with their respective obscurations of the light of truth, and with the virtual

[1] Fleury, Sixième Discours sur l'Histoire Ecclésiastique, s. ix. vol. xviii. p. xiv.

[2] From the Council of Florence, A.D. 1450.

denial of parts by consequence, yet retain the whole faith. Both, with their characteristic irregularities, retain the whole discipline of Christ. In the objective unity they are still one; in their great moral probation they have grievously fallen: without doubt, the peculiar faults of both are aggravated and made inveterate by division. The suspension of communion has deprived them of the mutual check and mitigating influence of each on the other, by which they might both have ripened to perfection. In the stead of this healthy discipline have come between them the irritations of defeated ambition and jealous resentment. Although the moral habit of both Churches is severely injured by this unholy strife, yet they have Sacraments both valid in themselves and efficacious to the saving of souls; they have the true knowledge of God, and the perfect traditionary type of the divine image, and the divinely-appointed discipline and probation of man's moral being. They are, in fact, members of the One Holy Catholic Church, and, though their mutual fellowship is suspended, they have all other blessings of which the One Church is the shrine and treasury.

I now come to the last form of the question in hand, namely, the suspension of communion between the Roman and English Churches. The same chief causes which divided the Eastern from the Western Churches divided also the Western Church itself. It would seem as if the same causes

of provocation, when they were baffled by the Greeks, fell with a more intolerable weight upon the West of Europe. The same exaggerated claim of universal jurisdiction was the cause of division in both cases. This is more conspicuously so in the West, where, through the silent working of ages, and by the aid of closer sympathies and bonds of mind and language, the doctrinal teaching of the Roman Church had for the most part quietly established itself. There was no question about leavened bread in the Eucharist, or about "Filioque" in the Creed, or the fire of purgatory. The whole matter resolved itself into the claim of supreme jurisdiction. If any man will look down along the line of early English history, he will see a standing contest between the rulers of this land and the bishops of Rome. The Crown and Church of England, with a steady opposition, resisted the entrance and encroachment of the secularized ecclesiastical power of the Pope in England. The last rejection of it was no more than a successful effort after many a failure in struggles of the like kind. And it was an act taken by men who were sound, according to the Roman doctrines, in all other points.[1] Questions of Faith had hardly as yet arisen in the Church of England when it released its apostolical powers from the oppression of a foreign and uncanonical jurisdiction. The corrections in doctrine and usage which

[1] Bramhall's Works, 'Just Vindication of the Church of England,' p. 62.

were afterwards made were neither the causes of the beginning nor of the continuance of the division. It was believed that the state of the Anglican Church would have been for the most part confirmed by the See of Rome on the submission of the Queen.[1] There is no one point in which the British Churches can be attainted of either heresy or schism. As for heresy, they openly profess the canonical Scriptures, the Catholic Creeds, the first six General Councils, rejecting, with the Council of Frankfort, the seventh, which alone, in addition to the first six, is received by the Greek Church; and with the Greek Church, rejecting all subsequent councils of the Western Church untruly pretending to be Œcumenical. With these also they acknowledge all true apostolical traditions, and submit themselves in preparation of mind to the definitions of a free and lawful General Council. This is enough, if the confession of their adversaries were wanting, to clear them of heresy. As for schism, they have done no more than take from off their neck a yoke which Christ never laid upon it, and that, too, not when it was meekly imposed, but when, through the wickedness of men, it became intolerable. Where is the charity and the ingenuousness of Romanist writers, who make much ado to show that the Bishop of Rome was from the beginning possessed of a lawful patriarchal jurisdiction over the British Churches? This is not the question. Even if that,

[1] Camden's Hist. of Elizabeth, pp. 46, 47.

which has not yet been proved or made so much as likely, were conceded, it would not establish the conclusion which they would impose on unwary minds. To a patriarchal power limited by the canons of the Church, and exercised in conformity with them, it remains to be seen what objection the English Church might have to raise. But this is an issue to which it has never been honestly brought. Premisses are advanced to show a patriarchal jurisdiction, but, "currente rota," in the conclusion we find a supreme pontificate. The Eastern Churches never denied to the Bishop of Rome his lawful patriarchal power. They professed it, and offered all precedence to it. Neither has the Anglican Church been called on to debate the issue on this footing. She has rejected — what the Eastern Churches rejected before—the arrogant pretence of an universal pontificate rashly alleged to be of divine right, imposed in open breach of apostolical traditions, and the canons of many councils. The Churches of the East are not schismatical for their rejection of this usurpation; neither are the Churches of Britain. But *they* are guilty of the schism that obtrude this novelty as the condition of Christian communion. Nor, again, would the British Churches be open to the lightest imputation of schism, if they were, with the usurped pontificate, to remove also the supposed patriarchal jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome. For the patriarchal authority is itself founded on the very canons to which the pontiff

refuses to submit. The defeat of his canonical privileges is with himself. He will not exercise them as they are intrusted to him; and the canons demand obedience on no other condition.

The attempt to impose an uncanonical jurisdiction on the British Churches, and a refusal to hold communion with them except on that condition, is an act of formal schism. And this is further aggravated by every kind of aggression: acts of excommunication, and anathema, instigations to warfare abroad, and to rebellion and schism at home, are the measures by which the Roman Church has exhibited its professed desire to restore unity to the Church of Christ. It must never be forgotten that the act of the Bishop of Rome, by which a most grievous and stubborn schism was begun in the English Church, was taken not in the character of patriarch, but in the title of Supreme Pontiff. The same bull which made a schism in every English diocese professed to depose also the Queen of England. It was a power to give away not sees, but thrones also; and the effect of this has been, as in the East so in England, to erect altar against altar, and succession against succession. In the erection of schism in diocesan churches, in the exclusive assumption of the name Catholic, in the reordination of priests, and in restricting the One Church to their own communion, there has been no such example of schism since the schism of Donatus.

The conduct, also, of the English Church is strictly parallel with that of the African. She acknowledges the members of the Roman Church as Christians, calls them brethren, recognizes their faith and Sacraments, admits their orders, and receives those that come to her communion without so much as conditional baptism. She acknowledges the body of Christ in all churches which are neither in heresy nor schism; she excommunicates none; she prays for all, and is, in heart and desire, at unity with those that refuse communion to her. So much, then, for the imputations of heresy and schism.

The suspension, therefore, of communion between the Churches of England and Rome is no hindrance to the obtaining of salvation on both sides. It would be beyond my present purpose to go into the question of the comparative openness of the way to life in the two Churches, of the means of knowledge and grace, and the fostering and disposing causes which tend towards salvation. All that need be shown is that on both sides the whole objective system of doctrine and discipline, a valid and lawful succession, with valid and efficacious sacraments, are retained; so that no man can perish but through sins of his own, which would alike destroy him in the purest Church of the earliest times. That such is the condition of the Roman Church, in spite of the corrupt traditions and ensnaring doctrines with which it is darkened and disfigured, we gladly ac-

knowledge. And whatsoever the designing or the deceived among them may say of the English Church, she knows too well the Catholic traditions to lend much heed to their unreasonable criminations. She is clear from any position or practice which can bring her under even the surmise of heresy and schism; and in all her dealing with those that anathematize her, she would follow His temper who bids us render "not railing for railing, but contrariwise blessing." Such being her state and posture of heart, she freely enjoys spiritual communion with Christ the Head of all, and with His mystical body, the "garden enclosed, the fountain sealed, the spring of living water," and with all the saints of God in the court of heaven.

GENERAL CONCLUSION.

Having now gone, as far as I have been able, through the course of the subject, I may shortly state the sum of the Catholic doctrine of unity, and with a few obvious remarks bring this work to an end.

We have seen, then, that there is a doctrine of unity, which, as a part of the Gospel of Christ, is the matter of a Christian man's belief: we have found that doctrine to be a part of the first elements of Christian faith, professed by every candidate for baptism: we have found also that the testimony of inspired and uninspired men delivers to us one definite and consistent scheme of unity, which accords both with the moral design of God revealed in Holy Scripture, and with the moral government of God unfolded in the history of mankind. The one Church, then, is the one only body to which, by the act of God, the salvation of Christ is by revealed pledges assured; and this one only body is proposed to us as an object both of faith and of sense. It is an object of faith in so far as it is invisible; and an

object of sense in so far as it is visible in the world. It is invisible in so far as it comprehends retrospectively all saints, from righteous Abel to this day, now gathered in the world unseen; and prospectively all who by the election of God shall hereafter be made members of it unto the end of time. It is visible in so far as, throughout the whole world, there is a body of men professing the Catholic faith under their lawful pastors; although to each man only that particular portion in which his own regeneration has been ordained is truly visible. But it is this member of the Church Catholic which is to each man the witness of the whole. It is to him the symbol of the whole object of faith, and the representative of the whole subject of sense. The Diocesan Church is to him the pledge of the Church Universal,—*ecclesia in Episcopo*. His own pastor, and the altar where he communicates in the Eucharistical sacrifice, is the test and the centre of all duties and obligations of love and loyalty; and to it he does the homage which he owes to the one holy Church throughout all the world. Such is the actual and the representative character of every Catholic altar. It is both an integral portion and a proxy of the whole Church, and a discipline and probation of the whole man.

Now, upon the sum of this doctrine I would make one or two remarks. And, first of all, it must be observed that the doctrine of unity here affirmed is grounded upon the positive ordinances

and revelations of God. It is a doctrine antecedent to the realization of unity in the Church; an objective idea declared by revelation antecedent to its objective manifestation in the world. The importance of this remark will be felt when it is remembered how easily and almost certainly the mind of man is biassed by the phenomena, whether truly or falsely apprehended, which appear before his eyes. The understanding is perpetually usurping upon the reason, first thrusting upon it false deductions, and then limiting its clearer and broader perceptions by the narrow reach of observation. As so many instances of this may be taken the many theories of Catholic unity; each one being a consequence of some imaginary principle assumed either *à priori*, from anticipations of what it should be, or, *à posteriori*, from observation of the existing anomalies of Christendom. There can be no doubt that most theories of Church unity are nothing more than either pious and charitable endeavours to adjust a scheme which shall embrace all professing Christians, or a refined hypothesis which shall serve some proximate design. There can be no doubt that the reason why many minds abandon the doctrine of unity, as it was believed by Christendom for fifteen hundred years, is that they are at a loss how to square with it the anomalies of the last three centuries. But for the unhappy rending of the Western Church, no man would have any more dreamed of gainsaying the mystery of the visible Church than of the visible

Sacraments. Men's minds have been bribed by their wishes, or perplexed by their difficulties, into lower and looser conceptions of unity. The doctrine here affirmed is affected by no such prejudice. It is a definite and substantive part of the original revelation; a mystery, a positive institution, having its basis in the wisdom and will of God. Its partial realization in the world, its many seeming defeats, and apparent anomalies, make no more against the truth and certainty of it than the contravention of immutable morality, the difficulties in the probation of individual men, and the partial extent of Christianity against the Gospel itself.

And this brings me to a second remark, namely, that this doctrine of unity can be shown to be false only by evidence the same in kind with that by which it has been here shown to be true, namely, by the Holy Scripture, and by the consent and practice of the Church, down to the time when the first anomalies arose on the face of Christendom. It must be perfectly obvious to every reasoning mind, that the condition of a part of Western Europe during the last three centuries cannot avail to unsettle the fixed rule of the Catholic Church for fifteen hundred years. We may, indeed, be unable to find any common term under which to bring both the Apostolical Churches and the self-originated communities of Christendom. It is impossible to find any scheme which shall not either exclude those communities from the unity of the Church,

or assert a right in man to make and unmake the conditions of his own probation. It is very true that the later history of the Church presents us with anomalies we know not how to deal with; we cannot explain, classify, or neglect them. They meet us in the attitude of objections; and they put our faith on trial. But, after all, they are to the Church no more than the inconsistencies and eccentric movements of individual character. These also are facts too visible to be denied, too exorbitant to be brought under the one law which harmonizes our moral life: they must be reserved to the judgment of Him who weigheth the spirits. So with the communities of Christians who have broken from the unity of the one Church. They are too visible to be overlooked, too full of anomaly to be brought under the rule which runs through the one Church of Christ. They must be remanded to the judgment of Him that walketh in the midst of the Golden Candlesticks. Let us "judge nothing before the time;" still less try to escape our difficulties by changing the ordinance of God. It may be that in this very perplexity lies a great part of our own moral probation.

And, lastly, the doctrine of Catholic unity is both definite in itself, and direct in its bearing upon practice. It is as definite as all the other articles of our baptismal creed; and it thereby delivers the minds of Christian men from the entanglements of a thousand controversies. The Catholic Christian is not set to seek out the one Church, forasmuch as by his

baptism he is already incorporated in it. He sees its oneness and its holiness in the Catholic and Apostolic faith and discipline. They are to him the landmarks of the old way, in which his feet already stand. The multiplicity, conflict, novelty, and narrowness of all other schemes and systems keep him, by a play of repulsive forces, in the one aboriginal and universal way of life. It is direct in its bearing upon practice, forasmuch as it is not more a rule of faith than of obedience. The duty of submission and forbearance, of maintaining unity, of keeping aloof from all acts and assemblies of schism, flows directly out of a belief in one holy Church. It is rather a life than a creed; and such is the simplicity and plainness of the way, that "the wayfarer though a fool shall not err therein." The baptized man that steadfastly believes his baptismal creed, and in contrition of heart both meetly partakes of the holy Eucharist and watchfully lives in accordance with the rule of that holy mystery, is not far from the kingdom of heaven. These, and no others, are the true conditions of Catholic unity, the only necessary terms of Catholic communion. More than this the Church has no power, and less than this she dare not fail to require of all Christian men. All other theological verities and opinions ought to be faithfully taught; and exterior submission to all true definitions may be exacted of her members. She may impose silence on doubtful questions, and yet leave the interior assent of men free unto themselves.

For all unity, save in the objective doctrine and discipline, is a moral habit, not grounded on agreement of opinion, but producing it; resting upon the unity of will to which it is pledged, that if in any thing we be otherwise-minded God shall reveal even that unto us.

And as these are the terms of unity among the members of each several Church, so are they among the several Churches of the one collective body.

Here, then, we may leave the subject of this work; believing and hoping that, although for our sins the Church be now miserably divided, it may yet be once more united. Let us only believe that it still retains the powers of recovery: we are divided because we have so little faith in the grace of unity. Let us steadfastly trust that our long-lost heir-loom will once more be found when by the grace of God the pride and arrogance, the selfishness, and contentious spirit of man are brought down to the primitive traditions of the one holy Catholic and Apostolic Church.

London: Printed by William Clowes and Sons, Stamford Street.

By the same Author.

1. THE ENGLISH CHURCH, its SUCCESSION, and WITNESS for CHRIST. A Sermon preached at the Visitation of the Archdeacon of Chichester. 1835. Rivingtons.

2. THE PRINCIPLE of the ECCLESIASTICAL COMMISSION. A Letter to the Lord Bishop of Chester. 1838. Rivingtons.

3. THE RULE of FAITH. Second Edition. 1839. Rivingtons.

4. NATIONAL EDUCATION. A Sermon preached at the Cathedral Church of Chichester. 1838. Rivingtons.

5. THE PRESERVATION of UNENDOWED CANONRIES. A Letter to the Lord Bishop of Chichester. 1840. Rivingtons.

6. THE SANCTITY of CONSECRATED PLACES. A Sermon preached at the Consecration of St. Mark's Church, Horsham. 1841. Mason, Chichester.

7. THE MORAL DESIGN of the APOSTOLIC MINISTRY. A Sermon preached at an Ordination in the Cathedral Church of Chichester. 1841. Murray.

8. A CHARGE delivered at the Ordinary Visitation of the Archdeaconry of Chichester. 1841. Murray.

9. THE MIND of CHRIST the PERFECTION and BOND of the CHURCH. A Sermon preached at St. Peter's Church, Brighton. 1841. Mason, Chichester.

10. THE UNITY of the CHURCH. 1842. Murray.

11. A CHARGE delivered at the Ordinary Visitation of the Archdeaconry of Chichester. 1842. Murray.

260.3K
M316

Manning H. E.

260.3K
M316